REPORT RESUMES

ED 010 552 24

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND EXCHANGE--A COMMUNITY STUDY. FINAL REPORT.

BY- DEUTSCH, STEVEN E.

WESTERN RESERVE UNIV., CLEVELAND

REPORT NUMBER CRP-S-222 PUB DATE AUG 65

REPORT NUMBER BR-5-8197

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$7.28 182P.

DESCRIPTORS- *FOREIGN STUDENTS, INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION, *HIGHER EDUCATION, PROGRAM EVALUATION, SURVEYS, INTERVIEWS, *COMMUNITY STUDY, STUDENT ADJUSTMENT, *ATTITUDES, FOREIGN RELATIONS, ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY, *EXCHANGE PROGRAMS, CLEVELAND, OHIO

A COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY STUDY WAS CONDUCTED OF THE FOREIGN STUDENTS AND THE INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF FIVE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE CLEVELAND AREA. THE GENERAL RESEARCH DESIGN EMPLOYED THE USE OF SUCH SURVEY METHODS AS HISTORICAL ANALYSIS, INFORMANT TECHNIQUES, PERSONAL INTERVIEWS, AND OBSERVATION. DURING A 2-YEAR PERIOD, QUESTIONNAIRES WERE ADMINISTERED TO SAMPLES OF FOREIGN STUDENTS, HOST FAMILIES, AND AMERICAN STUDENTS AND FACULTIES. RESPONDENTS TOTALED 1,018 (286 FOREIGN STUDENTS, 143 HOST FAMILIES, 376 AMERICAN STUDENTS, AND 213 AMERICAN FACULTY MEMBERS). AT THE SAME TIME, INTERVIEWS WERE CONDUCTED WITH EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATORS, LABOR AND BUSINESS LEADERS, STAFF MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL ON WORLD AFFAIRS, AND OTHERS INVOLVED IN INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS. AMONG THE AREAS COVERED IN THE INTERVIEWS WERE (1) PERCEPTION OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENT PROGRAMS (OBJECTIVES, ROLES TO BE PLAYED BY PARTICIPANTS AND OTHERS), (2) SOCIAL INTERACTION BETWEEN FOREIGN STUDENTS AND AMERICANS (STUDENTS, FACULTY, CITIZENS, AND STAFF PERSONS IN INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS), AND (3) EVALUATION OF SERVICES AND PROGRAMS (BUSINESS, ACADEMIC, PROFESSIONAL, AND VOLUNTEER) IN THE HOST COMMUNITY. REPORTED WERE (1) THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE IN VARIOUS AREAS, (2) FINDINGS FROM STUDIES OF THE FOREIGN STUDENTS AND THE COMMUNITY ROLE, (3) PERSPECTIVES OF INSTITUTIONAL INTERACTION WITH FOREIGN STUDENTS AND PROGRAMS, (4) FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD FOREIGN STUDENTS AND INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION, AND (5) DECISION-MAKING AND PLANNING BY ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL FOR FOREIGN STUDENT PROGRAMS AND BROADER INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES. TWO OF THE CONCLUSIONS WERE THAT (1) FOREIGN STUDENTS INTERACT TO A CONSIDERABLE EXTENT WITH AMERICAN FAMILIES, BUT MOST FEEL COMMITTED TO RETURN TO THEIR NATIVE COUNTRIES AND (2) CONSIDERABLE INTEREST IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION AND EXCHANGE IS EMERGING IN ALL QUARTERS (STUDENTS, FACULTY, ADMINISTRATION, COMMUNITY PEOPLE, AND FOREIGN STUDENTS). (RS)

ED010552

S-222
5-8197

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND EXCHANGE: A COMMUNITY STUDY

by

Steven E. Deutsch

Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio

INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND EXCHANGE: A COMMUNITY STUDY

Steven E. Deutsch

Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio

Final Report of a Study Submitted to

The Ford Foundation
and
The Cleveland Foundation

August 1965

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

LIST OF TABLES iv

INTRODUCTION 1
- A. Acknowledgements 1
- B. Description of the Study Procedure 3
- C. Scope of the Study and Outline of the Report 5

I HISTORY OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION AND FOREIGN STUDENT EXCHANGE. . . . 8
- A. Review of United States Programs. 8
- B. Review of Research Literature 12
- C. Review of International Education and Exchange in the Greater Cleveland Area. 20

II FOREIGN STUDENTS IN THE COMMUNITY. 32
- A. Description of the Study Population 32
- B. Findings from the Cleveland Survey. 36
  - I. Introduction 36
  - II. Preparation for Sojourn in the United States 37
  - III. Selection of College or University 40
  - IV. Academic Problems and Adjustment 42
  - V. Foreign Student Guidance and Counseling. 45
  - VI. Finances and Employment, Housing, Food, and Clothing 47
  - VII. Personal Problems: Homesickness, Discrimination and Other Factors. 51
  - VIII. Social Interaction of Foreign Students 52
  - IX. Preparation for Leaving and Plans in Home Country. . 55
- C. Conclusions 58

III MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY AND THEIR ROLES 63
- A. Introduction 63
- B. Who Are the Host Families? 64
- C. Recruitment and Orientation 65
- D. Foreign Student Hosts' Attitudes and Experiences 67
- E. Community Participation and Involvement in International Education and Exchange. 74
- F. Implications and Conclusions 77

IV AMERICAN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS 80
- A. Introduction. 80
- B. Interaction with Foreign Students 80
- C. International Student Group and Center 85
- D. Perspectives and Orientations Toward International Activities and Exchanges. 91
- E. Implications and Conclusions 94

Chapter Page

V AMERICAN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACULTY . . . 99
  A. Introduction . . . 99
  B. Faculty Experiences and Perspectives on Foreign Students . . . 99
  C. Is the World Our Campus? . . . 105
  D. Implications and Conclusions . . . 113

VI COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION . . . 116
  A. Introduction . . . 116
  B. Perspectives on Foreign Students . . . 116
  C. Perspectives on General Aspects of International Education and Exchange . . . 122
  D. International Education Policy-Making and Planning . . . 125
  E. Implications and Conclusions . . . 129

VII AN OVERVIEW--INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION: A COMMUNITY STUDY . . . 132
  A. Summary of Findings . . . 132
    Foreign Students . . . 132
    American Students . . . 132
    American Faculty . . . 133
    College and University Administration . . . 133
    Community Members . . . 134
  B. Integration of Findings Into Community Perspective . . . 135
  C. Goals in International Education . . . 135
  D. Recommendations . . . 139

APPENDIX

I. Sampling Procedures . . . 150

Tables

II. Foreign Student Enrollment in the Cleveland Area Colleges and Universities 1964-1965 . . . 152

III. Foreign Students . . . 153

IV. American Host Families . . . 158

V. American Students . . . 162

VI. Cleveland International Student Group . . . 164

VII. American Faculty . . . 166

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . 167

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1.1 TOTAL ENROLLMENTS OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS 23

1.2 TOTAL ENROLLMENTS OF FOREIGN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS 24

1.3 FOREIGN STUDENT ENROLLMENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS 25

2.1 SURVEY POPULATION AND NATIONAL POPULATION OF FOREIGN STUDENTS COMPARED 33-34

2.2 FOREIGN STUDENTS' ENGLISH LANGUAGE ABILITY 40

2.3 FOREIGN STUDENT ACADEMIC PROBLEMS. 42

2.4 SUMMARY OF FOREIGN STUDENT GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING EXPERIENCES 46

2.5 FOREIGN STUDENT NON-ACADEMIC PROBLEMS. 48

2.6 FOREIGN STUDENTS' BEST FRIENDS 53

2.7 INFORMAL SOCIAL RELATIONS OF FOREIGN STUDENTS. 54

4.1 AMERICAN STUDENT CONTACT WITH FOREIGN STUDENTS IF ANY, IN THEIR BUILDING 81

4.2 AMERICAN STUDENT CONTACT WITH FOREIGN STUDENTS IN ORGANIZATIONS. . . . 82

4.3 AMERICAN STUDENT RECENT CONTACT WITH FOREIGN STUDENTS IN AND OUT OF CLASSES 83

4.4 SUMMARY OF AMERICAN STUDENT CONTACT AND ACTIVITY WITH FOREIGN STUDENTS. 84

4.5 AMERICAN STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD FOREIGN STUDENT AND EXCHANGE PROGRAMS 92

4.6 AMERICAN STUDENT EXPECTATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITY 94

5.1 AMERICAN FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD TREATMENT OF FOREIGN STUDENTS. . . . 100

5.2 AMERICAN FACULTY CONTACT WITH FOREIGN STUDENTS 101

5.3 AMERICAN FACULTY EVALUATION AND RATING OF FOREIGN STUDENTS 102

FACULTY RATING OF FOREIGN STUDENTS 102

5.4 AMERICAN FACULTY JUDGEMENT ON THE MOST IMPORTANT REASON FOR ENROLLING FOREIGN STUDENTS IN AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES . . . 104

Table

Page

5.5 AMERICAN FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE. 108

5.6 AMERICAN FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES. 109

5.7 AMERICAN FACULTY EXPECTATIONS OF INVOLVEMENT IN INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES. 110

5.8 AMERICAN FACULTY ASSESSMENT OF INTEREST IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION AND EXCHANGE. 111

5.9 MOST IMPORTANT SOURCE OF IMPETUS FACULTY RECEIVED FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION AND EXCHANGE. 112

INTRODUCTION

A. Acknowledgements

This is the final report of a two-year project concerned with international education and exchange in the Greater Cleveland area. An interim report entitled "Foreign Students Program and Community Responsiveness" was prepared one year ago and indicated some of the perspectives of the research and the focus of the study. The present volume is an effort to enlarge upon some of the ideas already presented, to offer findings and illustrations from the data obtained, and to permit programmers and participants in international education and exchange to utilize the conclusions and implications of this community investigation.

Grateful acknowledgement is made to the Ford Foundation and the Cleveland Foundation for the financial assistance which made the study possible.

The five Cleveland colleges and universities and the Cleveland Council on World Affairs have cooperated on this project from the beginning. Presidents Alfred B. Bonds, Baldwin-Wallace College; T. Keith Glennan, Case Institute of Technology; G. Brooks Earnest, Fenn College; Father Hugh E. Dunn, John Carroll University; and John S. Millis, Western Reserve University, have offered their support throughout. The study director has been assisted in the preparation of this document by the comments received on the first report and the many persons consulting with him. The research advisory committee is composed of representatives from each of the respective institutions - Stanley Maxwell, Arthur P. Leary, Merriam C. Herrick, James M. Lavin, Lester Crocker - and the Cleveland Council on World Affairs.

Beneficial consultation was received from Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, City College of New York and Dr. Henry G. Russell, Executive Associate of Education and World Affairs. Dr. Ruth Hill Useem of Michigan State University not only offered professional consultation, but gave generously her insights and encouragement. In addition, other professional researchers have consulted on this project. Dr. Marvin B. Sussman, Chairman of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Western Reserve University has been helpful from the very beginning. Due recognition is given to the research staff of the project who have worked in a number of capacities: Phyllis Gary, Gail Jaffe, Carolynn Kim, Sally Kirkendale, Judith Kole, Gladys Kuoksa, Joan Salim, Eva Tsang, and Doris Wilkinson.

A community advisory committee was established to offer this study the perspectives of civic leaders and to assist in translating the findings into community and institutional programs. The members of this committee are: Carl S. Bechberger, Kenyon C. Bolton, Willard W. Brown, Edward H. deConingh, William J. Delancey, Mrs. Charles S. Higley, Mrs. Frank E. Joseph, Evan Lloyd, Sam Pollock, Ellery Sedgwick Jr., and Kent H. Smith.

The Cleveland Council on World Affairs has played a key role in this study and it is impossible to acknowledge all concerned with this organization. I would like to offer a very special word of thanks to Mrs. Charles N. Bang, former director of the educational and cultural affairs program, who played a most important role in initiating and launching this study, has offered help and criticism, and has been a wonderfully cooperative informant on international educational matters. Much assistance was given by: Donald Pryor, former director; Mrs. Burton Binyon, director; Mrs. Lucy Wetzel, former director of the educational and cultural exchange committee; Miss Marcia Smythe, former administrative assistant; Miss Valerie Brown, administrative assistant; Charles Bolton, program assistant in the educational and cultural exchange committee; and Mrs. Victor Filimon, Mrs. Edwin H. Smith, Mrs. Norman Shumway, Mrs. Owen Walker, Mrs. Allen Arnold, and the other members of the students department.

Many people demonstrated by their aid their commitment and interest in international education and exchange and appreciation is offered to this group, including Dennis Bates and Albert Blazer, foreign student advisors at Western

Reserve University and Case Institute of Technology, respectively. A general word of thanks is extended to the large number of people who have cooperated in this study, among them hundreds of foreign and American college and university students, professors and administrators, and community host families. These people all play important roles in the international aspects of higher education in Cleveland and it is hoped that the cooperation and interest shown in this study will be somewhat rewarded if this report is of value to persons who want to understand the nature of the Cleveland situation and the complexities and problems in international education and exchange. In the final analysis, this study was undertaken for every individual who has a personal commitment and involvement in international education, and the study director is most grateful for their role in demonstrating that the study was warranted and the interest genuine.

B. Description of The Study Procedure

The Cleveland Council on World Affairs and the five participating colleges and universities in the Cleveland area have had a cooperative non-academic program for foreign students for eighteen years. Enrollment rose and the community services and programs for students have been enriched. An interest developed in researching and evaluating the programs for foreign students, and the reaction of both the educational community and the larger community to them. Specifically, the broad purpose of the proposed research study was to examine the development of foreign student programs which involve the five colleges and universities in the metropolitan area; determine the effect of these programs upon foreign students, American students, faculty and school administration, and upon members of the broader community; and measure the total international dimensions of the institutions. Grants were made to the Council in December, 1962. The study was to be conducted by the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Western Reserve University. Preliminary work was begun in January, 1963, with the present writer as Study Director in a consulting capacity while on the Michigan State University faculty. The writer joined the Western Reserve University faculty in September, 1963.

The methodological objectives of the study were to gather historical records and to elicit attitudinal, experiential, and behavioral information by use of questionnaires and interviews with all of the groups involved in the scope of the study. Among the areas to be covered in the interviews were: 1) Perception of international student programs--objectives, roles to be played by participants and others; 2) Social interaction between foreign students and Americans (students, faculty, citizens in the broader community; professional staff persons in international programs) and 3) Evaluation of services and programs in the host community--business, academic, professional and volunteer.

The initial period of January through August, 1963 was spent in assembling materials, recruiting and training staff, and reviewing the literature to design and implement the study procedure. Historical analyses of student records at the schools and of the programs operated by the Cleveland Council on World Affairs were made during this first phase of the study.

Surveys of the total foreign student population were made at the close of the 1963 school year and again early in the 1963-1964 school year. A survey of community host families was conducted in the winter of 1964, American students and faculty were surveyed in the spring and summer of 1964. At the same time, interviews were held by the study director with key informants and administrative officials at each of the institutions, including presidents, deans, foreign student advisors, admissions officers and others. Interviews with selected community leaders were conducted during a part of the total study period.

The research advisory committee has met periodically to review the progress of the study and to permit feedback to the research staff. The community advisory committee has also met, and members have individually talked with the study director. Professional consultation has been helpful, and sustained on a regular basis. In addition extensive communication and a number of meetings with experts in international education have taken place.

C. Scope Of The Study And Outline Of The Report

Initially, the entire study was to be executed in one and one half years, from inception to the final write-up. The scope was broad, although the problem and the objectives of the study were specific. There was a need to do a comprehensive community study of the foreign students and the international aspects of the area colleges and universities.

After the study was begun, the study director was convinced that the focus would have to be unnecessarily restricted to complete the work in one year. The time period was extended to two years. I am grateful to the Ford and Cleveland Foundations for demonstrating their faith in the study and for having made renewal grants.

This report is based mostly on survey research methods; consequently it has the strength of large populations from whom data were obtained, and the weakness of detachment. However, the attempt throughout has been to employ historical analysis, informants, personal interviews and observation to complement the large-scale surveys. Some of the initial questions prompting this research could have been dealt with through a few select interviews and careful observational and historical analysis; however, these methods would have missed an important opportunity to have added to the research literature on international education.

As a result, the broader scope was chosen early as the focus of this study.

A number of researches have been published dealing with adjustment problems and interaction of foreign students on particular campuses. There is only one study of the entire educational complex of an urban metropolis,[1] although collaborative orientation programs have been emerging in several American cities. The urban centers such as Boston, New York, Chicago, and San Francisco are increasingly the points of concentration of large numbers of foreign college and university students. Consequently, a research inquiry into the nature of a community-wide educational exchange phenomenon seemed particularly appropriate. Consultation with persons at the Institute of International Education, Education and World Affairs, the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs and several universities supported the writer's belief that the scope of the Cleveland study should be broad enough hopefully to contribute not only to local educational planners but also to those elsewhere in the country concerned with the developments of the international dimension in American higher education and with the burgeoning of foreign student enrollments in American colleges and universities. Hence, while the data from the survey reflect Cleveland area populations, where the implications are broader such points will be made and comparisons drawn. At the same time the reader is cautioned to keep in mind that a community study does, indeed, contain the peculiarities of the specific community.

The body of this report follows in seven chapters. Chapter One outlines the history of educational exchange and the emergence of the international emphasis in American higher education, the research literature, and the history in the Cleveland area. Chapter Two presents the findings from the study of the Cleveland area foreign student population. In the third chapter the role of the community is discussed, including the results of the survey of foreign student host families and the nature of involvement of the business and civic community. Chapter Four examines the perspectives of the American college and university students in terms of their interaction with foreign students, general interest in international aspects of education, and the role of the Cleveland International Student Center. Chapter Five presents the findings of the survey of college and university faculty attitudes, experiences and perspectives or orientation concerning foreign students and the total range of exchange and international activities in higher education. Chapter Six focuses upon the decision-making and planning and the orientation of college and university administrative personnel with regard to foreign student programs and the broader international perspectives. In the concluding chapter, the findings of this community study are reviewed and placed into an integrated perspective. The goals of international education and exchange are examined in relation to the community under study, and on this basis recommendations are offered. A working selected bibliography is at the end of the report, following the appendix in which sampling is discussed and additional data tables are presented.

1. George A. Beebe, The Foreign Student in the New York City Area (New York: The Greater New York Council for Foreign Students, October 1955).

CHAPTER I

HISTORY OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION AND FOREIGN STUDENT EXCHANGE

A. Review of United States Programs

The history of educational exchange programs is long and varied, starting in Roman times, as Guy Metraux illustrates in his important historical study.[1] While the motivations for exchange of persons have undoubtedly been altered, the fundamental thread has been and continues to be the desire of students to obtain a quality and type of education unavailable in their home culture. An Institute of International Education study lists the following criteria designated by foreign students:

1) To advance the candidate's personal and professional development;
2) To prepare the candidate for service to his home country through the acquisition of additional knowledge and skills;
3) To promote international understanding;
4) To contribute to the advancement of knowledge through cooperative study and research with professional colleagues in the United States.[2]

Sponsoring groups have somewhat different objectives or goals, ranging from the promotion of international understanding and good will as the basis for world peace, to the foreign policy perspective of national governments.[3] It is clear that student motivations are more personally directed while sponsors of international exchange programs are more impersonal in their goals.

The United States State Department technical training programs form an important part of the total exchange-of-persons program. Since 1949 over 53,000 foreign visitors have come to this country under State Department auspices, which has emphasized the role that such a program plays as part of the total international effort of this country--the impact on mutual understanding, communication and the lessening of national stereotypes.[4] This foreign visitor population has some of the same problems of selection and orientation as the longer-term foreign student.[5] Although there are similar difficulties in personal adjustment such as language fluency, the foreign trainees are themselves overwhelmingly satisfied with their experiences and favorable in their evaluation of the training received.[6] While the success of such technical training exchange programs is of significance, both in terms of the numbers of foreign visitors and the total investment in them, this report focuses attention upon foreign college and university students, and exchanges and international programs involving participants in institutions of higher learning.

The history of foreign student enrollments in American colleges and universities goes back many years, if indeed it is not correct to state that there always have been students from other countries attending institutions in this country. Even though there are now well over 1,000 foreign students in attendance at the University of Michigan, for example, the percentage of the total enrollment made up by such students has remained almost constant over the past century.[7] In 1930 there were 9,643 foreign students in this country. By 1953 the number had grown to 33,647 and in the 1964-1965 school year there were 82,045 foreign students in American colleges and universities.[8] This represents an increase of about 900 percent from 1930 to 1965. During the same thirty-five year period the total enrollment of colleges and universities in this country grew from 1,100,737 in 1929-1930 to 4, 800,000 in 1964-1965, an increase of 450 percent. Thus, the increase in foreign student enrollments in the United States has occurred at twice the rate of total enrollment rises in American higher education.

In the past decade,[9] the foreign student enrollment has climbed from 34,000 to 82,000; yet, the percentages of students from each geographic area of the world have remained quite stable. The proportions of Europeans, Latin

Americans and North Americans have declined slightly, and the percentages of students from the Far East and Africa have increased. The greatest increase in the past few years has come from Africa, although Africans constitute only a little more than 8 percent of foreign students studying in the United States. A total of 159 countries and territories sent students to this country last year. Ten years ago 36 percent of foreign students were at the graduate level; in 1964-1965 the figure was 43 percent indicating a slow but steady trend over the years toward graduate study. No change has been manifested in the sexual composition of foreign students, which has remained at about 77 percent men and 33 percent women. While the number of institutions having foreign students continues to rise--1,859--the trend continues as areas become concentrated centers of foreign students: almost one-half of all foreign students were at 42 colleges and universities, each enrolling over 400 foreign students. The proportion of foreign students receiving financial support from the American and foreign governments has remained static for several years; however, the figures for self-supporting students has risen from 30 percent five years ago to 40 percent this past year.

More important than the statistical increase in the numbers of foreign students in the United States has been the impact that such exchanges have had in and by themselves and as part of the larger education planning in American higher education. Increasingly, the question has been asked about what the international dimension should be or what the relationships ought to be between world affairs and college and university life.[10] Within the past few years there has been a significant rise in the study of non-Western cultures,[11] foreign languages, and in the involvement of American colleges and universities in technical assistance and exchange programs.[12] It seems clear that the national commitment to international education is broad,[13] yet to a considerable extent chaotic and undisciplined. The last point is demonstrated by the numerous reports which again and again decry the lack of planning and the need for institutional study of its total international commitment. Among these publications are those distributed by a new organization, Education and World Affairs, Inc.[14] The prime objectives of these various reports has been to accent the burgeoning of foreign students, foreign scholars, American students and faculty going abroad, the increased stress on non-Western cultures and foreign language instruction, the increase in college and university technical assistance involvement, and the need for these various components to assume an important place in each institution's planning-curriculum, finance, recruitment of faculty and students, and so on. As is the case with the concentration of foreign students on a relatively small number of larger institutions, other aspects of exchange are disproportionately relevant for particular institutions. There were nearly 9,000 foreign scholars in the United States in 1964-1965, and 3,793 American faculty members were outside the country. However, some universities are particularly prominent in such exchanges: last year Michigan State University had 215 members of its faculty abroad, while the University of California had 554 visiting foreign scholars. On the other hand, of the 18,092 American college and university students studying abroad this past year, 73 percent of them were concentrated at 46 foreign education institutions.[15] While there are variations along a continuum of involvement among schools in the United States, it is true that the general international commitment has broad national implications and the urgings for program evaluation, research and planning have come from many quarters. The research literature is replete with studies of foreign students, and some of the more relevant and significant of these will be examined next.

B. Review of Research Literature

Research into various aspects of international education is voluminous and covers a broad spectrum of topics. The reader is referred to several sources or compilations and bibliographies.[16] The objective of this section is to review several research problems which have been examined and to present research findings of relevance to the present study.

A number of reports have looked at the institutional programs of exchange and assistance, tracing the development of such programs, their nature and operation, evaluating them and drawing conclusions. These have been presented both as case studies and as total inventories.[17] The general findings indicate that more American universities and colleges are participating in more assistance and training programs, largely government sponsored. Also there are more exchange programs: the more recent phenomena being consortia of institutions in technical aid programs (such as the Syracuse, Pittsburgh, Indiana and Michigan State joint effort at institution-building and development assistance) and in exchange programs such as the joint program among the Great Lakes Colleges Association to establish overseas locations for students from all of the member colleges. The conclusions from these studies vary. However, there are some consistent pleas for involvement of more schools in assistance and training programs. Some strongly suggest that these programs develop only as academically-warranted extensions of scholarly activities--with a research component, and with the expectation that such university involvement will provide for the academic enrichment of the institution's faculty and student body. The guidelines set forth which an institution can use to evaluate its own prospective and desired role in overseas and on-campus activities implies that institutions will vary in their international roles as they vary in terms of size, level of instruction or degrees offered, emphasis in curriculum, etc. Yet, the international commitment, President Sharp of Hiram College argues, should be profound and genuine in the smaller colleges.[18] And the emphasis on exchange and training is put on all institutions, not only in terms of the benefits for the individuals involved and the institution, but also for the national and international consequences.[19]

In summary, several surveys have been made of technical assistance and training functions of American colleges and universities, and priorities have been established among the criteria determining institutional involvement. Both government and university people have underscored the important role to be played by educational institutions. They stress the problems involved, the necessity of maintaining the traditional scholarly roles, and the need for adequate planning for such institutional involvement.

While a few studies have focused upon American faculty members who have worked and visited abroad, in general, professors have rarely been the subjects of social science research.[20] Hence, the data is extremely limited and we are unable to find in the literature studies of faculty attitudes toward foreign students, faculty attitudes toward, and participation in, international scholarly associations or cross-national programs of instruction or research. This obvious gap in the research literature was instrumental in prompting the survey of Cleveland area college and university professors.

Many studies have been done using college and university students as subjects, and several books have presented very thorough summaries of the literature along with bibliographies.[21] Rarely h[illegible]udies examined the international attitudes, experiences or aspirations of American students.[22] Fewer still have studied American-foreign student interaction. One such study at Indiana University is not yet completed and published;[23] one other is almost completely unique. Goldsen, Suchman and Williams attempted to study the nature of American-foreign student relationships, and particularly focused on the factors associated with American students which lead to cross-cultural social interaction. They found no support at Cornell University, for the hypothesis that American students friendly with foreign students are deviants and badly integrated into campus life.[24] Rather, they found that American students who did interact with foreign students tended to participate in the campus social milieu, were well integrated into the campus life and were association-minded; that is, they dated and participated in extra-curricular activities, belonged to social fraternities and organizations and were well satisfied with their lives as students at Cornell. The relationships with foreign students were facilitated by spatial proximity--living in dormitories together, etc.[25] Since Cornell is a residence school with a campus community, we might expect differences between it and institutions where there is little campus life and students live in physically disparate parts of the community, such as typifies many commuter and urban-based colleges and universities.

With the exception of these studies, research on American students' international orientations, activities, attitudes toward and interaction with foreign students, and related questions is almost non-existant. This, too, reinforced the need for that part of the Cleveland study which sought to probe these questions.

Another component in the total picture is the community outside of the educational establishments, which participates and responds to international exchange programs. A large number of private and community organizations, which are located throughout the United States, are concerned with hosting foreign visitors and working with foreign doctors and students. Some are involved generally in world affairs, international government, the United Nations, and other international work--government, church, private or educational. Evaluation researches have been done in several communities and by a number of these organizations.

One survey was done of community organizations in the United States serving international students, which demonstrates the depth and variety of services and programs operated by the hundreds of organizations.[26] Nevertheless, little is known about the kinds of people who participate in international community organizations, or the people who volunteer to host foreign visitors and foreign students. Although this extensive group of Americans plays an important role and relates closely to the international educational programs of colleges and universities, it has been little researched. Many questions concerning recruitment, orientation and program participation are still unresolved so far as professional planners are concerned. Later in this report, the findings from the Cleveland study will be presented, with the realization that this is one of the very few studies done of people outside the educational institutions who are an integral part of the total programs.

The findings of several surveys discussed above show that a few of the larger universities have the bulk of the international programs--including technical assistance government contracts, language-and-area centers, non-Western area studies programs and curricula, large numbers of faculty and students abroad and large numbers of foreign visiting faculty and students.

Melvin Fox of the Ford Foundation concludes,

> The universities that are thus heavily involved in international activities are the ones that most need to review their programs comprehensively for their external effects and internal applications. Once such individual surveys have resulted in firm university (as distinct from departmental) policies and plans, it may be possible for universities to coordinate their overseas projects by countries, regions, or kinds of problems. There are strong indications that specializations of this type will develop increasingly in the sixties. If so it would profoundly affect the way in which individual universities deal with their foreign students.[27]

This observation of the importance of over-all planning in international educational activities for the operation of foreign student programs is echoed in various significant policy papers and report recommendations.[28] Yet, most institutions have been lax in their efforts to coordinate and comprehensively evaluate such activities. Furthermore, Homer Higbee's study of the foreign student advisors reveals an insufficient approach to working with foreign students on the campus, and since his report was published in 1961 the foreign student enrollment in this country has mushroomed; increasing the scope of the unresolved problem.[29] Thus, on one hand there is the national phenomenon of growing foreign student enrollments and the large-scale increase of international educational activities. On the other, recommendations for over-all planning have been made by the Ford Foundation, Education and World Affairs and other organizations, and for specific planning for foreign students by the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. And yet, American colleges and universities basically have failed to cope effectively with these problems. Some institutions have developed outstanding over-all approaches, first by defining international education, then by assessing the institution's objectives and resources, and lastly, by indicating priorities and plans for the implementation of declared objectives of the total program--ranging from admissions procedures of foreign students, to government contract research requisites, to classroom instruction in languages and cultures. A peculiar situation obtains when it is pointed out that the research inquiries have focused heavily on total institutional achievements and structured programs but not on the participants themselves. Higbee's study focused on foreign student advisors, the Goldsen and Blau studies examined American students, and a number of studies were based on foreign students. However, there is a lack of coordinated research dealing with all of these populations at specific institutions. Hopefully, this report will offer such a perspective, and may assist with over-all planning.

The total volume of studies of foreign students is substantial. A recent bibliography included over 80 theses and dissertations of foreign students alone while compiled bibliographies on foreign student studies run into the many hundreds. The annual roster of research in progress in the international field includes histories of exchange; the role of education in development; the achievement, adjustment, language problems, attitudes, admission, orientation, hospitality and return experiences of foreign students.

The last item is the most neglected. As Brewster Smith pointed out in an early essay, studies of the impact of exchange are needed, but rare.[30] While a number of evaluation studies have been done for the Agency for International Development and the Department of State, rather little is known about foreign college and university student alumni. The report by Moore and Forman stresses the importance of maintaining contact with foreign alumni, indicating their potential contributions to the American college or university in terms of recommending and screening students, liaison with overseas programs, etc.[31] It is also pointed out that the continuing relationship is important for the foreign alumni, and furthers his personal development and growth. Homer Higbee has underscored this point as a factor contributing to the initiation of a newsletter sent by Michigan State University to its foreign alumni. The need for additional studies of foreign students after they have returned home to their own cultures is still present. Furthermore, several studies have shown that as the foreign student approaches the end of his study in this country he encounters difficulties in attempting to reorient himself to his own culture. A type of reverse "culture shock" is experienced by some returning students. This raises questions about the need for pre-departure orientation programs for students comparable to those conducted for shorter-term foreign visitors under the Department of State and Agency for International Development auspices. As one study report asked,

> Is there not a very critical need for using orientation centers in reverse, to prepare foreign students needing such preparation, for the opportunities as well as the inevitable disappointments and frustrations that will meet him on returning to a nonindustrialized country? Orientation at the end of the foreign student's stay in the United States might recapitulate and interpret his experiences here, sort out from the total program the insights which were purely American those which might be applicable at home, and provide a decompression chamber to ease the strains of going back into old patterns of life. It would also provide an opportunity to report on his experiences in America and clarify his viewpoints on the nature and purpose of those phases of American life in which he participated during his stay.[32]

Although the number of studies on various aspects of foreign students in American colleges and universities is great, several comprehensive bibliographies have been prepared and the National Association for Foreign Student Advisors has published reviews of the more significant studies.[33] In 1961, the National Association for Foreign Student Advisors published the report of the Waldenwoods Seminar which focused on foreign student research.[34] This most useful document contains a full bibliography, a presentation of research findings and research in process, and outlines many not-yet-researched questions concerning admissions, orientation, academic and personal counseling, language, extra-curricular activities and departure. Some of the findings from research discussed in this seminar report have been implemented in actual foreign student programming: special instruction of English as a foreign language, special orientation for new foreign students, specially designated advisors to foreign students, efforts to integrate the student into campus life in terms of housing and social activities, and similar specific objectives.

In 1952 the Social Science Research Council created a Committee on Cross-Cultural Education, which supported research culminating in a series of monographs.[35] These researches were empirical case studies of foreign students on select American campuses, and in some reports, a follow-up was done on students in their home countries. It was found that foreign students in smaller colleges tended to interact with greater frequency with Americans, and that their adjustment was facilitated by social relations with people of the host country. Physical living arrangements were consistently seen as affecting the foreign student's potential interaction and contact with Americans. Research evidence challenges the theory that the degree of adjustment of the foreign student is equated with attitude changes; that is, the foreign student may adjust well and not manifest great attitudinal change. This has been shown to be true for American students overseas as well.[36] Other relevant factors in the adjustment process of the foreign student included adequate English language fluency, orientation, availability of especially competant as well as sympathetic advisors and counselors, and the institutional bases for facilitating cross-cultural contacts, such as an international center or club.

Additionally, these studies of foreign students have indicated some of the problems typically encountered: clothing for a strange climate; financial difficulties,[37] adjustment dilemmas concerning diet, dating patterns and academic matters, and so on. The larger and more fundamental social science research questions are still in need of research. What happens to the individual personality undergoing adjustment to a new cultural milieu? What are the mechanisms whereby persons transcend their cultural bindedness and join what John Useem calls "the Third Culture?"[38] To what extent and in what way and under what conditions are attitudes changed through international activities?[39] These and other social psychological and anthropological questions are deserving of continued research. Some of these perspectives will be discussed later in this report.

C. Review of International Education and Exchange in the Greater Cleveland Area

The increase in enrollments in American colleges and universities has been tremendous during the post World War II years, and the "baby boom" of the war years will produce a significant rise in the college age population during this decade. Cleveland has a number of higher educational institutions, representing a range of sizes and types of control. Until the present incorporation of Fenn College into the newly-created state university, all schools were private. This explains the very modest increase in total enrollments over the past years, during the time in which the national figure has soared. Table 1.1 presents the statistics on total enrollment at the five schools participating in the study and the national figures.

The increase in foreign student enrollment in this country has more than kept pace with the total enrollments. However, as shown in Table 1.2 the total number of foreign students attending Cleveland institutions has not increased at the same rate as for the country as a whole, although compared to the increase in total local enrollments during the same period, 1952 to 1964, the proportion is higher. Nationally, the foreign student population has consistently risen; yet, some of the local college and university figures have fluctuated, suggesting a possible shift in administrative policy. This becomes particularly noticeable when we see the modest gains or stability at most schools, but the significant decline in foreign student enrollment at Case Institute of Technology during the past three years. This becomes clearer when looking at Table 1.3 which shows foreign student enrollment as a percentage of the total enrollment. Case Institute almost doubled enrollment from 1952 to 1957, but the foreign student population decreased. From 1957 to 1962 the total enrollment at Case Institute rose only slightly while the foreign student figures showed an increase of about 240 percent. In 1963, there were about 15 percent more foreign students in the country than in 1962; yet the number dropped slightly in Cleveland, and rather considerably at Case Institute, where in the same year total enrollment rose. From 1963 to 1964, foreign student enrollment increased 10 percent nationally, and again the figures for Cleveland schools dropped slightly. Foreign students constituted 1.7 percent of American college and university enrollments in 1964 (1.6 percent in 1952) and 1.1 percent of Cleveland enrollments (1.0 percent in 1952). Case Institute has consistently had the largest proportion of foreign students, but dropped from 6 percent in 1962 to 3.9 percent in 1963 and 3.8

percent in 1964. The figures at the other institutions are fairly constant.

To summarize - foreign student enrollments in the United States have risen sharply in the past decade and will continue to rise so that total number should be at least 100,000 by 1970. While the rate of increase has kept pace with the total rise in students attending American colleges and universities (with an annual increase of 10 percent), this probably will not continue. In the Cleveland area the total enrollment rise has been far behind the national figure, however it may be the only large urban center in the country without a tax-supported institution.[40] There will probably be a stabilization or modest increase in foreign student enrollments at several of the Cleveland schools, while the situation is not clear at the others. The development of a new state university and the admissions policy in regard to foreign students are two variables which will influence future trends in foreign student education in Cleveland.

TABLE 1.1

TOTAL ENROLLMENTS OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

	1952	1957	1962	1963	1964
Totals for United States	*2,148,284	*3,068,417	*4,206,672	*4,528,516	(est.) *4,810,000
Totals for Five Cleveland Schools	19,026 (100.0)	20,509 (100.0)	21,700 (100.0)	21,894 (100.0)	21,505 (100.0)
**Western Reserve University	9,770 (51.4)	7,311 (35.6)	8,062 (37.2)	8,525 (37.7)	8,376 (38.9)
Case Institute of Technology	1,106 (5.8)	2,128 (10.4)	2,221 (10.2)	2,484 (11.3)	2,304 (10.7)
John Carroll University	2,174 (11.4)	3,210 (15.7)	3,734 (17.2)	3,852 (17.6)	3,892 (18.1)
Baldwin-Wallace College	1,676 (8.8)	1,835 (8.9)	2,139 (9.9)	2,206 (10.1)	2,233 (10.4)
Fenn College	4,300 (22.6)	6,025 (29.4)	5,544 (25.5)	5,100 (23.3)	4,700 (21.9)

Numbers in parentheses are percentages

Sources: The World Almanac and Book of Facts; various years; *Digest of Educational Statistics, U.S. Office of Education, 1964; **Western Reserve University Registrar's Office.

TABLE 1.2

TOTAL ENROLLMENTS OF FOREIGN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

	1952	1957	1962	1963	1964
Totals for United States	34,000	43,000	64,705	74,814	82,045
Totals for Five Cleveland Schools	182 (100.0)*	157 (100.0)	265 (100.0)	252 (100.0)	246 (100.0)
Western Reserve University	94 (51.7)	76 (48.4)	109 (41.1)	114 (45.3)	116 (47.2)
Case Institute of Technology	65 (35.7)	51 (32.5)	121 (45.7)	96 (38.1)	87 (35.4)
John Carroll University	10 (5.5)	11 (7.0)	21 (7.9)	18 (7.1)	23 (9.3)
Baldwin-Wallace College	7 (3.8)	12 (7.6)	10 (3.8)	18 (7.1)	16 (6.5)
Fenn College	6 (3.3)	7 (4.5)	4 (1.5)	6 (2.4)	4 (1.6)

*Numbers in parentheses are percentages

Source: Open Doors, Institute of International Education, various years.

TABLE 1.3

FOREIGN STUDENT ENROLLMENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL ENROLLMENT OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

	1952	1957	1962	1963	1964
Totals for United States	1.6	1.4	1.5	1.7	1.7
Totals for Five Cleveland Schools	1.0	0.8	1.2	1.2	1.1
Western Reserve University	1.0	1.0	1.4	1.4	1.4
Case Institute of Technology	5.9	2.4	6.0	3.9	3.8
John Carroll University	0.5	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.6
Baldwin-Wallace College	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.8	0.7
Fenn College	0.1	0.1	0.07	0.1	0.1

An historical study of foreign students who attended Cleveland area colleges and universities in the past years was attempted. The research objective was to determine the shifts, if any, in the characteristics of students coming to Cleveland, and how this might affect the services and programs.

The methodology proposed was to use personal and demographic information from the files of the universities and colleges. Although most institutions keep rather complete records of their American alumni, it was found that records on foreign student alumni go back in some instances as little as two or three years, and is incomplete.

The proportions of missing information for 1117 former foreign students in Cleveland schools for specific categories is as follows: year of arrival at school, 26.7 percent; sex, 6.7 percent; marital status, 14.1 percent; field of study, 26.2 percent, and degree earned, 54.7 percent.

The unfortunate condition of records at the respective institutions makes historical trend analysis of limited utility, and thus cannot be presented. A strong suggestion is offered for minimally accurate record-keeping of foreign student information both while enrolled and as alumni.

The institutions themselves have rather limited facilities and services for foreign students, even granted the small number of foreign students in Cleveland compared to, say, New York. None of the colleges or universities included in the study has an international study group or center, although the Cleveland Council on World Affairs operates one joint center for students at all schools-as discussed later in this volume. The schools have neither a full-time faculty or staff foreign student advisor; however, an individual is designated as foreign student advisor in each institution in either the dean of students or the admissions office. Liaison is maintained between the foreign student advisors and the Cleveland Council on World Affairs. While the host family and social programming usually are managed by the Council, everyday problems of passports, visas, housing and other similar matters are more frequently handled at each institution. Each institution pays a stipulated per-foreign-student allotment to the Council on World Affairs to operate its programs, a fact which is critical in understanding the role of the Council and the orientations of the institutions relative to foreign students in Cleveland.

In the next chapter the characteristics, attitudes and experiences of foreign students in Cleveland colleges and universities will be examined.

Footnotes

1. See Guy S. Metraux, Exchange of Persons: The Evolution of Cross-Cultural Education, Social Science Research Council, Pamphlet 9, June 1952.

2. Committee on Educational Interchange Policy, The Goals of Student Exchange, January 1955, p. 5.

3. The perspectives of the government are examined by Howard E. Wilson, "Education, Foreign Policy, and International Relations," in Robert Blum (editor), Cultural Affairs and Foreign Relations (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963). See also, Committee on Educational Interchange Policy, Twenty Years of United States Government Programs in Cultural Relations, September 1959; Philip H. Coombs, The Fourth Dimension of Foreign Policy: Educational and Cultural Affairs (New York: Harper and Row, 1964); Charles A. Thompson and Walter H.C. Laves, Cultural Relations and U.S. Foreign Policy (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963).

4. The U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, A Beacon of Hope: the Exchange-of-Persons Program, April 1963, p. 1.

5. Ibid., pp. 3-6.

6. See Steven E. Deutsch and George Y.M. Won, "Some Factors in the Adjustment of Foreign Nationals in the United States," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 19 (July 1963), pp. 115-122.

7. Personal interview with Dr. Robert Klinger, International Center, University of Michigan.

8. Source: Cora DuBois, Foreign Students and Higher Education in the United States (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1956); Institute of International Education, Open Doors, 1965.

9. Figures in this paragraph come from ibid., pp. 4-11.

10. For a full discussion on these questions of education and world affairs, see Howard E. and Florence H. Wilson, American Higher Education and World Affairs (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1963).

11. See "The Non-Western World in Higher Education," November 1964 issue of The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science; Association of American Colleges, Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts College, 1964.

12. See Edward W. Weidner, et.al., The International Programs of American Universities (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1958); R. Freeman Butts, American Education in International Development (New York: Harper & Row, 1963); Education and World Affairs, AID and the Universities, 1964.

13. See "The Rising Demand for International Education," May 1961 issue of *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science.*

14. For example, see Education and World Affairs, *The University and World Affairs*, 1960; *The College and World Affairs*, 1964.

15. *Open Doors 1965*, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-13.

16. An annual register of *Research in International Education* is published by the Institute of International Education and the National Association of Foreign Student Advisors. Among the available bibliographies are *International Educational Exchange: A Selected Bibliography*, U.S. Office of Education, 1961 and later editions; Franklin Parker, *Government Policy and International Education: A Selected and Partially Annotated Bibliography*, to be published by John Wiley & Company.

17. Among these are Weidner, *op.cit.*, and the entire series of Michigan State University publications on American universities programs by Adams and Cumberland, Smith, *et.al.*; Edward W. Weidner, *The World Role of Universities* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962); *The Role of American Higher Education in Relation to Developing Areas*, proceedings of a conference, American Council on Education, 1960; Education and World Affairs, *AID and the Universities*, *op.cit.*; Butts, *op.cit.*; Walter Adams and John A. Garraty, *Is the World Our Campus*? (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1960); *Education and the Modernization of Nations*, proceedings of a conference, American Council on Education, 1964.

18. Paul F. Sharp, "The International Commitments of the American College," Hiram College *Alumni Broadcaster*, Winter 1964.

19. See the testimony before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, Hearings of the United States House of Representives Committee on Foreign Affairs, *Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive*, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

20. See Gordon MacGregor, *American Fulbright Scholars*, Society for Applied Anthropology, 1962.

21. For example, Philip E. Jacob, *Changing Values in College* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957); Rose K. Goldsen, *et.al.*, *What College Students Think* (Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand Company, 1960).

22. Peter M. Blau, "Orientation of College Students Toward International Relations," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 59 (November 1953), pp. 205-214.

23. Robert H. Shaffer and Leo R. Dowling, "Foreign Students and Their American Friends," unpublished study, Indiana University, 1964.

24. Rose K. Goldsen, Edward A. Suchman, and Robin M. Williams, "Factors Associated with the Development of Cross-Cultural Social Interaction," *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 12 (1956), pp. 26-32.

25. It might be noted that the Shaffer and Dowling study, *op.cit.* at Indiana University is interviewing all students living in a large graduate complex, which controls the physical access and should make other differences more revealing.

26. Alice R. Pratt, *Survey of Community Organizations in the United States Serving International Students*, Community Section of the National Association of Foreign Student Affairs, April 1963. See also the paper by Katherine C. Bang, "The Community's Role in Cross-Cultural Education," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 335 (May 1961), pp. 54-65.

27. Melvin J. Fox, "Foreign Students in American Colleges" Ford Foundation reprint from *College Board Review*, Winter 1962.

28. See Education and World Affairs reports, *op.cit.*; *The College, The University and the Foreign Student*, Committee on the Foreign Student in American Colleges and Universities, 1963.

29. Homer D. Higbee, *The Status of Foreign Student Advising in United States Colleges and Universities* (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1961).

30. See M. Brewster Smith, "A Perspective for Further Research on Cross-Cultural Education," *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 12 (1956), pp. 56-68.

31. For a study of University of Minnesota foreign alumni, see Forrest G. Moore and Robert E. Forman, *The University and its Foreign Alumni: Maintaining Overseas Contacts* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1964).

32. *Steps Need to Improve or Develop Programs to Meet the Needs of Foreign Scholars, Students and Trainees*, Study Report presented at the Centennial Convocation, American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, November 1961, pp. 49-50.

33. In addition to the research in progress as well as completed, compiled yearly by the Institute of International Education and the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, the following bibliographies and reviews are useful: *Foreign Students in the United States: A Selected and Annotated Bibliography*, by William W. Brickman for the College Entrance Examination Board, 1963; *Summaries of Evaluation Studies of the Educational and Exchange Program*, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State, published periodically; *Selected Studies in Inter-Cultural Education*, edited by Robert D. Porter for the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, November 1962; *Research Studies in Inter-Cultural Education*, edited by Werner Warmbrunn for the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, April 1960; Margaret L. Cormack, *An Evaluation of Research on Educational Exchange* (Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State, August 1962).

34. Research in Programs for Foreign Students, edited by Josef A. Mestenhauser for the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, June 1961.

35. See the statement on this series in the preface to the last book published, Claire Selltiz, June R. Christ, Joan Havel, and Stuart W. Cook, Attitudes and Social Interactions of Foreign Students in the United States (Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 1963).

36. See John and Jeanne Gullahorn, American Students in France (mimeographed, Michigan State University, pp. 188, 214-215).

37. One study has shown that financial difficulties affect students from different world areas in varying ways. See, Factors Related to Financial Problems of Foreign Students, The Greater New York Council for Foreign Students, October 1963.

38. John Useem, "The Community of Man: A Study in the Third Culture," Centennial Review, Vol. 7 (Fall 1963), pp. 481-498.

39. Herbert C. Kelman deals with this question in, "Changing Attitudes Through International Activities," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 18 (1962), pp. 68-87.

40. According to the Institute of International Education, Open Doors 1965, there are 41 foreign students enrolled at institutions of higher learning in Cleveland not included in the study. See Appendix II.

CHAPTER II

FOREIGN STUDENTS IN THE COMMUNITY

A. Description of the Study Population

In order to assess student perspectives, experiences and attitudes, two surveys were conducted: one covered all foreign students who were enrolled at the five institutions in the late spring of 1963, and the other included all new foreign students enrolled in the fall of 1963. The total rate of response was 76 percent. A check revealed no substantial differences between the students participating in the study and the non-respondents.[1] The data presented are drawn from the questionnaire surveys.

Foreign students are predominantly male--79 percent--which is expected since both Case Institute of Technology and John Carroll University have predominantly male enrollments. Yet this is close to the national proportion.

Approximately one-fourth of the foreign students are married. Of these, 85 percent have their spouses with them in this country. Since the married students are almost all male, the services for foreign student wives are an important part of the adjustment process.

The aforementioned characteristics of the Cleveland group are not fully comparable to those of the total foreign student population in the United States because of differences between the Cleveland and national figures on other dimensions: nationality, age, level in school, and field of study.

As seen in Table 2.1, about 41 percent of the foreign students are from the Far East, as compared to 36 percent of all foreign students in the United States. Less than 6 percent are from Africa while the national figure exceeds 8 percent.

TABLE 2.1

SURVEY POPULATION AND NATIONAL POPULATION OF FOREIGN STUDENTS COMPARED
(In Percentages)

	*Foreign Students in the United States (Total = 82,045)	Foreign Students in the Cleveland Survey (Total = 286)
World Area		
North America	11.4	12.2
Latin America	16.6	12.7
Europe	12.3	14.1
Africa	8.4	5.7
Far East	35.8	40.6
Near and Middle East	13.7	12.7
Oceania	1.5	0.6
Sex		
Male	77	79
Female	23	21
Level		
Graduate	42.8	58.9
Undergraduate	46.5	32.3
Other	10.7	8.8
Field		
Agriculture	3.9	0.0
Engineering	22.0	25.0
Humanities	19.6	(9.2
Education	4.9	(
Natural and Physical Science	17.6	24.6
Social Science	15.4	9.2
Business Administration	8.7	14.8
Health Services	6.0	6.3
Other	2.0	11.0 (law, library science, social work, home economics, no major)

Source: *Institute of International Education, Open Doors 1965.

TABLE 2.1 (continued)

SURVEY POPULATION AND NATIONAL POPULATION OF FOREIGN STUDENTS COMPARED
(In Percentages)

Sources of Support	*Foreign Students in the United States (Total = 82,045)	Most Important Source of Support	Foreign Students in the Cleveland Survey (Total = 286)
Self-supporting	38.9	Self-supporting	39.1 (parents, part-time work, summer work, husband or wife, other relatives, personal savings)
U.S. Institution	17.8	U.S. Government	7.0
Private organization	9.0	U.S. Foundation	2.1
U.S. Government	7.3	U.S. community, church group, citizen, private sponsor	4.1
Foreign Government	4.8	Home government, home community, home industry	10.4
U.S. institution and private organization	2.6	International Association	1.4
U.S. Government and U.S. institution	1.8	Professional Association	1.4
Foreign Government and U.S. institution	1.0	College or University	28.3
U.S. Government and private organization	0.7	No information	5.9
Foreign Government and private organization	0.3		
No information	15.9		

Source: *Institute of International Education, Open Doors 1965.

The age distribution of the majority of foreign students is much like that of American students, ranging between 20 and 30 years of age. However, one out of four is over 30 years old. The relatively older ages are understandable since almost three-fifths of the foreign students are in graduate school. This is significantly at varience with the national figure of just over two-fifths of foreign students at the graduate level.

Studies pursued by Cleveland's foreign students are, in rank order of frequency: engineering; physical and natural sciences; business and commerce; humanities, education and social sciences, and health services. On a national basis, foreign students are often in fields such as agriculture and public administration at many state universities. Since well over four-fifths of the Cleveland students attend Case Institute of Technology and Western Reserve University, the concentration in engineering and professional fields is to be expected. Thus, foreign students in Cleveland reflect the nature of the local institutions as do the 100 foreign faculty members who visited at Western Reserve University in 1963. Fully one-third are in the fields of physiology, biochemistry, biology and microbiology. The remainder are concentrated in the medical, health, and natural and physical science fields. It is clear that the foreign students and foreign visiting faculty reflect in their academic specialties the nature of the local institutions.[2]

Turning to the sources of financial support for foreign students, note that the data for the national scene and for the Cleveland area are not entirely comparable. The Institute of International Education listed the student's total sources of support, while the Cleveland survey asked for the one most important source of support. The proportion of self-supporting students is very nearly the same and the proportion of foreign students indicating support from the United States government is similar. However, support from the student's college or university appears to be more important in Cleveland than for the country as a whole, probably because the majority of Cleveland's foreign students are at the graduate level where research assistantships and other aid is more readily available.

The atypical characteristics of Cleveland's foreign students are emphasized because of the possible affect on students' attitudes and experiences. For example, their graduate status suggests a higher age range, which may present different problems. Similarly, the small proportion of African students and the large numbers of Asian and European students may have some bearing on social adjustment phenomena, including language fluency, social interaction with Americans, and so on. While the findings can be generalized to some extent, findings about Cleveland's foreign students may reflect peculiarities in the community, the institutions, and the students themselves.

B. Findings From the Cleveland Survey

I. Introduction

The objective of the surveys of foreign students was to supplement the perspectives of the professionals who work with these students, i.e., the foreign student advisors and the Cleveland Council on World Affairs staff and volunteers. In these surveys, an attempt was made to obtain full portraits of the foreign students--their backgrounds, their preparation for the sojourn to America, and their attitudes and experiences in this country--both academic and extra-curricular. In the discussion that follows, particular attention will be paid to those findings which have relevance for the educational institutions and for others responsible for foreign student programs.

One final introductory note. The first survey encompassed all foreign students in attendance at local colleges and universities at the end of one academic year; the second was concerned with all new foreign students at the beginning of the subsequent year. Thus, some of the respondents had limited experience in Cleveland, while others had spent a longer time at their institution. A statistical analysis reveals that there are differences between these groups on several important dimensions. On some of these, the data presented come only from the group with longer tenure and experience--for example, the listing of problems experienced. In other cases, it is simply noted that students present for a shorter time had fewer interaction experiences with Americans, although findings are presented for both groups.

II. Preparation For Sojourn in the United States

Important factors in the total adjustment and ultimate successful career of the Japanese foreign student, according to Bennett, Passin and McKnight, are the student's background-status in Japan, his sponsorship, and the nature of Japanese cultural values and attitudes towards America at varying points in history.[3] Other studies have also stressed the preparation and selection factors, but there are still important research gaps. This study was not designed to do a full sojourn analysis of the student, which would include his selection, preparation in his home country, sojourn experiences in the United States, and follow-up. However, some information was obtained concerning the backgrounds of the two hundred and eighty-six foreign students studied.

About 30 percent of the students have had no work experience in their home countries, and are continuing their student careers in this country. Almost 20 percent had previous work experience in engineering, 14 percent in teaching, and 12 percent in business and commerce. A possible conclusion from these statistics may be that these foreign students are in practical occupations and the majority are studying after having had work experience; hence, they may have more desire for applicable rather than theoretical knowledge. This point will be discussed further.

An important and basic social-psychological concept is that of predictability and closure. Put simply, persons are better able to adapt and adjust to situations about which they have been informed and which seem to have an identifiable structure. One would expect that in traveling from one culture to another, the more information a person has about the different culture, the easier he will adapt to it. Indeed, this is built into many exchange-of-persons programs: American Fulbright-award professors are given special orientation; foreign trainees coming to the United States are given courses about America, and so on. Since the majority of foreign students coming to the United States are not sponsored by the American Government, their information comes from a variety of sources and varies in depth and accuracy. Four percent of the students in this study received very little information about the United States before coming here, while 51 percent had some and 46 percent had very much information. Their information about the United States mostly came from two sources: friends and relatives (38 percent), and books or magazines (30 percent). While the information may be accurate and helpful, it is, nevertheless, significant that sources such as the American consulate and, more importantly, educational organizations such as the Institute of International Education, provide rather little information for the foreign student in his home culture as he prepares for the sojourn. This may reflect the student's apathy, but underscores the need for outreach to be initiated by an American agency or institution.

The situation becomes more serious when the students' statements about what they knew before they arrived about the college or university they are presently attending here are examined. Ten percent had no prior information, 24 percent had very little, while the remainder had some or very much. An obvious conclusion from this finding is that the American institutions must provide more information for the foreign student if the number who are ill-informed before arrival is to be reduced from the present one-third. Only 38 percent of the students indicate that the most important source of information about the American college or university is the school itself.

A number of studies have demonstrated that English language fluency is a factor in foreigners' adjustment in this country.[4] The factor of language has repeatedly been mentioned as a critical element in foreign student admissions. Recently a world-wide English language testing program has been established to help determine competence in items ranging from textbook comprehension to ability to contribute to classroom discussion. The findings in this study reveal a variation in students' ability. As shown in Table 2.2, the typical pattern emerges with the same conclusion: foreign students coming to the United States are inadequately prepared in English language useage in a significant number of cases. The findings are subjective self-ratings by foreign students, but the foreign student advisors and faculty members also indicate the existence of language problems and the need for greater pre-enrollment and special language training.

TABLE 2.2

FOREIGN STUDENTS' ENGLISH LANGUAGE ABILITY
(In Percentages)

Language Use Activity	Fluent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total Number
Read textbooks	51.1	33.2	12.5	3.6	281
Understand lectures	41.8	30.5	22.7	5.0	282
Understand Class Discussion	39.6	27.9	21.8	11.1	281
Write examinations	36.1	28.2	27.1	8.6	280
Write Class reports	35.0	26.4	28.2	10.7	281
Contribute to class discussion	30.8	19.7	26.9	22.6	279

In addition to the student's language ability and his information about the host culture and host institution, the factor of specific orientation was included as part of the queries about sojourn preparation. The findings of the survey are startling. Three-quarters of the foreign students state that they had no orientation prior to enrolling in their present American college or university. The remaining one-quarter received orientation in Cleveland under the auspices of the school or the Cleveland Council on World Affairs; or from an institution outside the local community such as the Institute of International Education, Agency for International Development, Experiment for International Living, or from special programs such as the English language program at the University of Michigan. More will be said about orientation in the section which follows.

III. Selection of College or University

It has already been pointed out that one-third of the students receive very little or no prior information about the American school they are attending. At the same time, many of these men and women consider a range of schools, just as do American students. Just over one-quarter confine their search to the school in which they enrolled. Over one-third consider other schools but say that the school which they are attending was their first choice. Four major reasons are given for choosing the school in which they enrolled: about one-half mention the education and training available there; one-quarter give financial considerations as the most important factor, and the remainder, in almost equal proportions, mention either the geographical location or the recommendations made to them by others.

A somewhat surprising finding is that one-third of these foreign students have previously attended other American colleges and universities. The large number of transfer students explains the varying lengths of time that students have spent in this country prior to enrollment at the present school: one-quarter of the students have been in this country for a year or longer before their enrollment in local schools. Although the survey does not show what proportion of the students moved from an American undergraduate to a graduate or professional school and what proportion transferred from one institution to another while remaining at the same level, the implications of these findings are still critical. The proportion of students who receive local orientation is small, as stated above. The need for such programs is clear and should be incorporated among the objectives for expanded foreign student programs. But there is an additional point which stems from the revelation that a large number of foreign students new to the institution are not immediately new to American culture. Namely, local orientations should particularly stress factors helpful to adjustment in the local institutional and community milieu. This may, in fact, call for some unlearning and relearning for foreign students already experienced in other American environments.

IV. Academic Problems and Adjustment

The foreign students attending colleges and universities in the Cleveland area are generally satisfied with their educational experiences--29 percent completely satisfied and 53 percent mostly satisfied. At the same time, they do encounter problems of an academic nature. The number and variety of academic problems that students who have been at their present school for at least one academic year have are illustrated in Table 2.3.

TABLE 2.3

FOREIGN STUDENT ACADEMIC PROBLEMS
(In Percentages)

Academic Problems	Many Times	Sometimes	Hardly Ever	Never	Total Number
Not knowing enough English	8.5	22.2	18.2	51.1	176
Not knowing which courses to take	6.3	23.3	29.5	40.9	176
Not being able to take the courses I want	10.7	24.9	20.9	43.5	177
Finding school work too difficult	4.0	28.3	30.1	37.6	173
Finding school work too easy	2.9	30.9	28.6	37.7	175
Not having enough time to study	13.8	42.0	20.1	24.1	174
Finding courses do not apply to future work	9.3	37.8	23.8	29.1	172

Better than one-half have no difficulties with English language in general but almost one-third have difficulties sometimes or many times (note Table 2.2

for more specific foreign student self-ratings on English fluency). The proportion of students who never feel school work is too easy and the proportion who never find it too difficult is the same. The proportions are also the same for those who do think school work is too difficult and those for whom it is too easy. A small percentage find work too hard or too easy on many occasions. One in seven foreign students often has difficulty in finding enough time to study. Somewhat more significant is the finding that one out of eleven students feels that many courses do not apply to his future work, while almost two-fifths find that this is sometimes the case. Now, this is not startling and may not be too different from the attitudes of American students. It does suggest that perhaps foreign students should be particularly oriented to the concepts of American liberal arts education philosophy that are found even at the graduate and professional school level. While one cannot ascertain the foreign students' expectations about the amount of vocational emphasis in American education, they are probably affected by the fact that most foreign students who come to the United States have prior work experience in their homes cultures which is largely in applied fields.

Very little difference obtains in asking the student to rate his own academic performance compared to other foreign students and to American students. That is, the proportion of foreign students who believe they are doing as well or better than other foreign students is the same as the proportion who state that they are doing as well or better in their studies compared to American students. The only discrepancy worth noting is that 6 percent state that their academic work is worse or much worse than that of other foreign students, while 12 percent rate themselves as such in relation to American students.

One final measure of the degree of satisfaction with their experiences is whether the foreign student would recommend his institution to others in his home country. Forty-five percent recommend the school highly, 32 percent believe their school is as good as any other, 13 percent would not say one way or another, and finally, 10 percent of the foreign students would tell fellow countrymen to attend another American college or university. However, interpreting the one-in-ten negative recommenders as being dissatisfied with their institution is unwarranted, since some undoubtedly have the region, climate, city, or other consideration in mind. As an additional point of information, only 4 percent of these students would recommend that fellow countrymen attend a college or university in a country other than the United States.

In reviewing these facts, it might be concluded that the foreign students attending Cleveland area colleges and universities are not having overwhelming problems of an academic nature. Nor do they indicate major language problems, although some difficulty is reflected. They rate their academic accomplishments rather well compared with other foreign students and with American students. Some typical problems of having time for studying, doing a high quality of work and getting desired courses are observed. Such problems should be expected of all students--foreign or American. The foreign students in this study manifest some problems of adjustment. There is an over-concern voiced in much of the literature, where the goal appears to be a problem-free environment for foreign college and university students; yet the educational process is a learning experience and ought not to be a "greased tube" through which one calmly passes. At the same time, it is important to recognize that foreign students do have problems peculiar to persons displaced from their own cultures and that special services should be available for such students. In addition to language assistance, guidance and counseling is an area where the American host institution should be aware of its responsibilities when accepting foreign students.[5]

V. Foreign Student Guidance and Counseling

Although foreign students indicate that their problems are not overwhelming, they do experience some difficulties which require special assistance. Relations with the United States State Department, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Institute of International Education, home embassies, and so on, present problems which American students in this country do not have. As previously stated, most students do not receive formal orientation. Few are oriented by the Cleveland Council on World Affairs or the particular institutions which they attend. This point deserves attention, since no campus is without an orientation program for new American students--the almost-universal Freshman Week. While general orientation may well be done in a coordinated fashion by a group of local institutions,[6] there is a need for some orientation into the specific institution and local community. Other studies show that there is a relationship between the amount of student guidance and counseling needed and requested by foreign students and the nature of the initial orientation.

Each school designates an individual, either from the admissions or dean of students office, as advisor to foreign students. The survey reveals that 62 percent of the students do not use the foreign student advisors' office at all; only 16 percent use the office for personal counseling, and 3 percent for academic counseling. Of those using the foreign student advisors' office, the overwhelming majority find this helpful or very helpful. The conclusion is that the foreign student advisors are doing very well with the students being serviced, but they have contact with a minority of the foreign students and the counseling is largely non-academic in nature. Table 2.4 summarizes the foreign students' experiences with the foreign student advisor and other counseling channels. The major academic counseling is performed by faculty

TABLE 2.4

SUMMARY OF FOREIGN STUDENT GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING EXPERIENCES
(In Percentages)

Academic Counseling Services - (Total Number = 258)	
Have not needed services	20.9
Cleveland Council on World Affairs	1.2
Dean of Men/Dean of Women	1.9
Faculty advisor	38.7
Foreign Student Advisor	2.7
Member of faculty or staff	12.4
American student	7.8
Person in selected profession	2.3
Clergyman	0.4
Someone from home country	10.5
American family	0.4
Another foreign student	0.4
Own parents	0.4
Use of Foreign Student Advisor's Services for Personal Counseling - (Total Number = 281)	
Have not needed services	40.9
Foreign Student advisor checked	16.0
Other services checked, but not foreign student advisor	43.1
Use of Foreign Student Office - (Total Number = 281)	
No	62.3
Yes, very helpful	13.9
Yes, helpful	19.2
Yes, not very helpful	3.9
Yes, not helpful at all	0.7
Use of Cleveland Council on World Affairs - (Total Number = 285)	
No	46.7
Yes, very helpful	27.0
Yes, helpful	21.8
Yes, not very helpful	4.2
Yes, not helpful at all	0.4

members (the source for about one-half of the students), although some students go to the Council on World Affairs to obtain academic counsel.

As to the involvement of the Council on World Affairs, it is clear that the longer the student is in Cleveland, the more he avails himself of its programs. While three out of five students here for one year or longer have used the services of the Council, only two out of five of the new students have done so. While the Council on World Affairs works very closely with the respective schools' foreign student offices, it is significant to note that by a quantitative measure, more students use the services of the Council than the services of the foreign student advisors' office. This apparently reflects the probably unique situation in the Cleveland metropolitan area. While other cities have consolidated programs,[7] the emphasis upon programs offered by the Council on World Affairs is such that the institutions perceive little need for programs of their own, and operate few. The adequacy of this entire arrangement is called into question in several places in this report. Certainly the role and use of the foreign student advisors' office is an issue for each college and university, and must be appraised in relation to the off-campus programs supported by the schools through the Council on World Affairs.

VI. Finances and Employment, Housing, Food, and Clothing

As shown earlier, about 40 percent of the students are self-supporting; 28 percent are supported by the college or university they are attending. Additional sources of support include the American government, other governments, and foundations and international agencies. As is generally the case in income evaluation, one either can examine the objective picture or the subjective reports given by respondents. That is, a determination study of actual income of the student and the number of persons dependent upon that income might have been done, and conclusions drawn about the students' relative ability or inability to make ends meet. Rather, the foreign students were asked to indicate their problems of finance and employment. Table 2.5 summarizes the non-academic problems of the students who have experienced at least the one academic year in their present setting. More than two-thirds of

TABLE 2.5

FOREIGN STUDENT NON-ACADEMIC PROBLEMS
(In Percentages)

Non-Academic Problems	Many Times	Sometimes	Hardly Ever	Never	Total Number
Not having enough money	15.3	43.5	14.7	26.6	177
Not being able to find a job	19.0	36.2	20.0	24.8	105
Never looked for a job					68
Not having comfortable housing	9.1	17.0	19.9	54.0	176
Not having the food I'm used too	21.5	24.9	13.0	40.5	177
Not having the necessary clothing	2.3	16.0	19.4	62.3	175
Feeling homesick	14.3	47.4	18.9	19.4	175
Experiencing racial or cultural discrimination	6.3	19.0	22.4	52.3	174
Meeting Americans	19.3	20.5	24.0	36.3	171
Following the American pattern of dating	12.9	21.5	23.9	41.7	163
Following the American pattern of social etiquette	11.2	30.6	21.8	36.5	170
Following the sanitary habits I'm used too	9.7	7.3	15.2	67.9	165

the foreign students report not having enough money sometimes or many times. While this may be the reflection of American students as well (feeling that one just does not have enough in contrast to the ideal situation), it does, in and by itself, suggest that financial questions are of concern to the students from other countries. The students give the following responses to the question of their actual ability to manage on their present source of support: very well (23 percent), fairly well (54 percent), a little less than needed (16 percent), and barely enough (7 percent). Forty-nine percent of the students indicate that no unexpected expenses occurred. The remaining one-half have experienced a variety of unexpected expenses. About one quarter of these say they have had unexpected expenses in entertainment, local transportation, clothing, textbooks and supplies, and travel in the United States. Over one-third state that medical, dental and health expenses are higher than expected. This suggests that information which would more adequately portray the financial requisites of attending the particular institution should be given to foreign students prior to their arrival. Also suggested is the need for institutions to provide better services (say in the health area) without cost. This in turn, is an argument in favor of the recent proposals that federal aid be given to colleges and universities which have foreign students on campus.

A second problem for foreign students is their expectation that it will be easy to find employment to help support themselves. Aside from the legal restrictions, well over one-half of the students who sought employment have had difficulties, as shown in Table 2.5. Summer employment of foreign students is a national problem, as revealed by a 1963 survey done by the Institute of International Education. Greater participation by various employers and organizations was encouraged in Cleveland, but these sources provided little cooperation when the Cleveland Council on World Affairs attempted to provide a job placement service for foreign students. This is certainly an area in which the business community has the potential for making a greater contribution, both locally and nationally.

One-third of the foreign students live on campus or in college or university housing; the remainder are off-campus. Although over four-fifths of the students are mostly or completely satisfied with their housing, over one-quarter of the students who have been here one year or longer said they have had housing problems many times or sometimes. Just over one-quarter of the students live alone. The rest live with others, including just over one-fifth who are in this country with their families. Interaction between foreign and American students is facilitated by the fact that almost one out of four foreign students lives with an American student. One out of eight lives with other foreign students. In summary, almost one-half of the foreign students live with their families or live alone; one-third live with Americans (either students or an American family), and the remainder live with other foreign students. As shown in other studies, the housing pattern is critical in determining interaction of foreign students with Americans.

As demonstrated in a study of foreign students in New York City, persons from various countries spend different amounts for food. However, the proportion of their income spent for food is smaller in the United States than most other countries in the world. Foreign students attending Cleveland area schools do have food problems, as shown in Table 2.5--22 percent often, 25 percent sometimes. However, this is a catch-all category which includes beef served to Hindus and the unavailability of fresh mangoes in January.

Nevertheless, the proportion experiencing food problems is significant, and should be dealt with on the campuses where the trend is towards having larger proportions of students live in dormitories.

One-quarter of the students have experienced unanticipated expenses with clothing. Less than one-fifth of those who have spent at least a year here have problems with clothing sometimes or often. In many college communities there is a loan service which provides warm clothing to students from more temperate climates.

VII. Personal Problems: Homesickness, Discrimination and Other Factors

The position taken here is that members of the host culture should not strive to create an absolutely trouble-free environment for students from other cultures. Yet, some issues are obviously more problematic than others. Homesickness is a universal phenomenon. One out of seven foreign students often experiences this feeling, while almost one-half are sometimes homesick. One out of five students is never homesick. This group may include Canadians, who would not feel to a great extent that they had left their home culture. On the other hand, this group may include those foreign students who reject their home cultures, those who intend to remain in the United States, or those for whom the readjustment process in their home culture will be difficult. This point shall be discussed later.

Discrimination on the basis of race is a reality in American society. American citizens experience such discriminatory practices in Cleveland and it should be expected that this would occur to foreign students. This has never happened to a little over one-half of the students. As shown in Table 2.5, one out of four students state that they have experienced racial or cultural discrimination sometimes or often, and almost 25 percent, rarely. While more elaborate data concerning the basis of discrimination (housing, places of public accomodation, etc.), is not available, it clearly looms rather large both as a perceived problem and an actual negative experience for the foreign students included in this study.

VIII. Social Interaction of Foreign Students

Foreign students do have the expected problems of meeting Americans, dating and learning the social graces. This is attributable to cultural differences, heavy involvement in academic life and a variety of personal characteristics. A statistically significant relationship exists between length of stay in the present American situation and extent of social interaction with Americans. For the students who have spent at least one year in Cleveland, as seen in Table 2.5, one-third have problems in dating either often or sometimes, more than two-fifths have difficulty in following the American pattern of social etiquette, and two-fifths have difficulty sometimes or often in meeting Americans. However, for the total group of students (both the new students and those of one year or longer), only one-fifth are dissatisfied with the opportunities for meeting Americans. That is, the students are generally satisfied with the opportunities, but do experience some problems, which is to be expected. Nevertheless, for the one student in five, the opportunity of social interaction with Americans is unsatisfactory. The student's satisfaction with the opportunity of meeting Americans is a reflection of his actual interaction experiences, since there is a statistically significant relationship here.

Table 2.6 reveals some interesting trends. The students were asked to indicate how many, if any, of their five best friends are fellow-countrymen, other foreign students, American students, or non-student Americans. It appears least likely that a foreign student will have no American friends; and

TABLE 2.6

FOREIGN STUDENTS' BEST FRIENDS
(In Percentages)

Best Friends	None	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Total Number
Own Countrymen	35.8	30.8	15.8	9.7	4.3	3.6	279
Foreign Students	42.1	38.1	12.6	4.3	1.4	1.4	278
American Students	21.4	25.0	21.4	15.9	9.1	7.2	276
American Non-Students	43.6	22.0	20.9	6.6	4.4	2.6	273

it is most likely that Americans will be among the five best friends that a foreign student has. Of their five best friends, in 31 percent of the cases only one is a fellow-countrymen; and in 38 percent of the cases, one is another foreign student. This composite strongly suggests that foreign students in this study are very likely to include American students among their closest circle of friends.

Additional interactional data are presented in Table 2.7. There is a predictable pattern: the student interacts most with other students of the same sex (dormitories, etc.), then with members of the opposite sex (dating, classes, etc.), then with professors. Younger foreign students are distinctly more likely to interact with other students, those of the opposite sex and professors than are older students - a reflection also of marital status. While 15 percent of the students are in the home of an American family more than once a week, only 8 percent are never in an American home. The number who have visited American homes is overwhelming, and the number of families visited is also significant: 56 percent have visited from one to five families;

TABLE 2.7

INFORMAL SOCIAL RELATIONS OF FOREIGN STUDENTS
(In Percentages)

Informal Social Relations with:	Frequent Contact (More than once a week)	Occasional Contact (Once a month or less)	Never	Total Number
Families in their homes	15	77	8	281
Members of student's own sex	52	38	9	262
Members of opposite sex	28	47	25	257
Business people	7	46	48	239
Professors	23	48	28	254
Students	61	30	9	268

18 percent have visited from six to ten families; and 12 percent have been in eleven or more families' homes. The students' evaluations of these interaction experiences with American families are positive. Only 5 percent have unfavorable reactions, 82 percent are favorable and the remainder both favorable and unfavorable. This experience appears to be a sustained one throughout the school year, since weekends and evenings account for the majority of visits; holidays and school vacations are less frequently the occasion for family visits. This is in contrast to some communities where the foreign students' experiences in American homes is largely limited to vacations and holidays. This undoubtedly reflects the active and year-around host family program operated by the Cleveland Council on World Affairs in cooperation with the colleges and universities, which will be examined in the next chapter.

One other indicator of foreign student interaction and community involvement was studied. Findings of several studies show that foreign visitors' awareness of social and political issues correlates with their interpersonal contact and involvement. Utilizing these conclusions, the Cleveland Council on World Affairs has arranged programs to which foreign students have been invited and has urged the students to attend certain social and community events.

Conversely, Americans' attitudes toward other cultures are related to their knowledge of the culture and personal acquaintance with its members. As a result, the Council on World Affairs has operated a speakers' bureau. During the 1961-1962 and 1962-1963 academic years, 68 foreign students were listed as having given 161 formal presentations. The three most frequent topics were the student's country of origin (45 percent), education (11 percent), and the role of women in the student's home country (10 percent). The talks were given to church groups (37 percent), adult service and community organizations (17 percent), private clubs, study groups or alumni groups (15 percent), and schools or PTA groups (12 percent). The moderate but consistent level of participation by foreign students in concerts, tours, lectures and meetings illustrates an important component of the students' interaction and involvement, and also the role that this population plays in the broader community. It should be quickly pointed out that these are only officially reported statistics or known activities and is probably a low estimate of total involvement.

IX. Preparation for Leaving and Plans in Home Country

While one-fifth of the foreign students will be in the United States for a year or longer after leaving their present school, over one-half of the students will depart from the United States immediately after leaving their school. This suggests an abrupt departure from the American cultural milieu and a return to the home culture--a problem for many participants in a variety of international exchange programs. Conceivably, local foreign student programmers might interpret this as presenting a need for pre-departure orientation to lessen the reverse "culture shock." The program could be similar to the seminars operated by universities for the Agency for International Development foreign trainees before they return to their home cultures. Such orientation would be geared to sensitizing the foreign student to the problems of readjustment in his home culture and making him aware that he has changed as a result of his American experience and consequently will very likely be an agent of cultural change upon his return.

A question which has been increasingly raised in academic and governmental circles concerns the ultimate goal of the foreign college and university student. As one recent article asks: foreign students--exchange or immigration?[9] The rate of non-returning foreign students is high, almost 100 percent for some areas and countries.[10] In some not-yet published surveys, foreign students were asked to indicate their plans and intentions for returning or staying. The question undoubtedly holds different relevance for the students newly arrived than for those who have been studying in this country for a varying number of years. Of the foreign students in this study, 5 percent do not plan to return to their home countries, another 14 percent are undecided, 21 percent say they probably will, and the remainder state that they definitely plan to return. Lack of positive commitment to return suggests a serious consideration of the alternative. The combined total of students who are planning not to return and those who are undecided approaches one out of five foreign students studying in the Cleveland area. It is important to note that both professional foreign student advisors and this study restrict the definition of a "foreign student" to those on a student-type visa, and exclude students on immigration visas, i.e., those who have clearly indicated their intentions of remaining in the United States. In summary, 60 percent of the students are certain that they will return to their home countries after they complete their studies. For the remainder, attitudes range from a slight possibility of remaining here to a genuine commitment to remain in the United States. Although the rate of return for this group cannot be documented, it is important to recognize the less than full commitment to return to the home country.

Thirty percent of the foreign students have had no previous work experience in their home countries. Among the others who have worked, 48 percent expect that upon their return they will secure employment different from that which they had prior to their American educational experience. The students of longer tenure here were also asked about their occupational expectations ten years after they returned to their home country. Fifty-five percent of these students indicate that a change from their initial employment is expected upon their return. While 23 percent of the students say that the reason they came to this country was the subsequent ability to be of more use to their home country, 38 percent mention educational advantages and 27 percent stress personal occupational goals. That is, individual students' goals of exchange are expressed first in personal terms (education and occupation), then in national terms, while the broad "international understanding" motif is subordinate in their perceptions.[11] Presumably, foreign students come to study in American schools to receive education and training unavailable in their home country. The impact that this experience will have upon the individual's own career is clear to him, just as it is to the labor economists and others who are concerned with human resource development in the process of advancement in the less-developed nations.[12]

C. Conclusions

This chapter has attempted to summarize the enrollment trends of foreign students in the Cleveland area colleges and universities and has presented some findings from the surveys of foreign students done as part of the total investigation of international aspects of education in this community.

The enrollment projections may be made most tenuously for the Cleveland community, although it is safe to predict the constant rise in national enrollments of foreign students. In the Cleveland area a state university, which will absorb a former private college, is just beginning. As a private school, the enrollment of first-year foreign students was prohibited. It was geared to commuter students who engaged in a cooperative work-study program. The impact of the new state university is far from clear, although comparable institutions in other metropolitan areas have accounted for significant numbers of foreign students.

Another unknown variable is the conscious admissions policies of the respective institutions. There is rather direct evidence that the decrease in enrollment of foreign students is the reflection of an institutional policy, and under these circumstances, predictions cannot be safely made. A final variable is the financial assistance program of the American government. Some of the private institutions indicate a willingness and interest in increasing the enrollment of foreign students, but the financial abilities of the institutions are restricted. If a significant program is established whereby private schools receive federal government funds for each foreign student enrolled, the impact upon the Cleveland institutions might be substantial.

The surveys of foreign students were designed to tap the student's attitudes and experiences, as well as to present a profile of the foreign student population. The unfortunate absence of well-kept, accurate and complete historical records of foreign students suggest the need to obtain a clear picture of the present population. It is recommended that each institution initiate a systematic method for keeping good records of all current and future foreign students and that files on former students be developed.

Students in Cleveland approximate the national profiles in many ways, although some notable differences are recorded. Specifically, there is a significantly larger proportion of graduate students in this community, which should influence the kinds of services offered.

The fact that many students come to the Cleveland school with prior experience in this country suggests the need for special types of orientation. A jointly operated, comprehensive orientation program for new foreign students appears to warrant serious consideration. Additionally, the need for a predeparture orientation program might be explored.

Greater information concerning the United States, the local institution and the local community should be given to the foreign student while he is still in his home country. The foreign students appear to use the foreign student advisors' office to a limited extent. Further inquiry should be directed to see if this reflects an inadequacy of staff or staff availability, and how such services might be improved.

The foreign students experience a variety of problems of a personal, nonacademic nature. The developing facilities at the institutions will figure importantly in the solution of some of them, such as housing, food, and lack of interaction with Americans. Yet other structures, such as the International Student Center, might deal more adequately with these difficulties. The International Student Group and Center shall be discussed in a later chapter.

English language is somewhat of a problem, and perhaps more attention should be given to future applicants' achievement on language examinations. Special language instruction programs should be increased. Some such services are now available locally, but high course fees are charged.

The foreign students in this study have experienced some academic difficulties, which reflect not only the students' backgrounds, lack of familiarity with American institutions, and language barriers, but also possible difficulties in obtaining sufficient academic counseling. Once again, there is a suggestion that the counseling services be evaluated as to their adequacy.

A final noteworthy conclusion is that a number of foreign students are not committed to returning to their home countries. Some special counseling should be provided along these lines, although there is a considerable controversy about how such cases should be dealt with by foreign student advisors.

It has been shown that foreign students interact with American families to a considerable extent. This is due to an active program sponsored by the Cleveland Council on World Affairs which encourages close host family-foreign student relationships. This program and the role of community members will be examined in the next chapter.

Footnotes

1. See the Appendix for discussion of sampling problems in the several surveys.

2. An additional indication that the Cleveland institutions attract particular foreign visitors is the fact that visiting foreign faculty come predominantly from developed nations or developing countries with large, professionally trained populations. In 1963-1964, no foreign visiting faculty came to Western Reserve from Africa. Almost one-third came from India and Japan, and one-fifth were from Canada and the United Kingdom. In the same year more than one-half of the foreign visiting faculty at Case Institute of Technology came from Western Europe, particularly the United Kingdom. The remainder came from Japan, Israel and India.

3. John W. Bennett, Herbert Passin, and Robert K. McKnight, In Search of Identity (Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1958).

4. See, for example, Steven E. Deutsch and George Y.M. Won, "Some Factors in the Adjustment of Foreign Nationals in the United States," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 19 (July 1963), pp. 115-122. On the matter of testing foreign students' English language ability and the teaching of English to foreign students, see the following articles in Overseas, Vol. 3 (January 1964): Melvin Fox, "English As A Second Language-Development," pp. 14-17; Clifford Prator, "English As A Second Language-Teaching," pp. 18-21; David Harris, "English As A Second Language-Testing," pp. 22-25.

5. On the question of admission and service responsibilities, see Education and World Affairs, The Foreign Student: Whom Shall We Welcome?, 1964; Committee on the Foreign Student in American Colleges and Universities, The College, The University and the Foreign Student, 1963. A study at the University of Kansas urged greater pre-admission language training, coupled with improvement of orientation. See Clark Coen, A Study of International Students Attending the University of Kansas Concerning Some Selected Opinions and Attitudes About the United States, Its Educational System and Particularly That of the Attended Institution, October 1963 (mimeographed).

6. For an illustration of the joint orientation to foreign students program, see the report of the first such experience in Boston: Boston Area Seminar for International Students, Final Report of the Summer Orientation Program, 1963. The Cleveland Council on World Affairs, in its arrangement with the schools to operate non-academic programs, has a poorly-attended brief orientation, which is optional and occurs after the students have begun the academic year. The basis for cooperative, comprehensive orientation does exist however.

7. A community-wide program is operated by the Minnesota International Center for Students and Visitors in the Minneapolis area; however, this is a complement to programs and services at each educational institution, while the Cleveland Council on World Affairs may be characterized more as a substitution for institutional services.

8. The format for such information sheets to be sent to foreign students before they arrive is presented in Guidelines, published by the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs and distributed nationally to member foreign student advisors.

9. On this theme see Gregory Henderson, "Foreign Students: Exchange or Immigration?" Newsletter of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, (November 15, 1964), pp. 1-4; also by the same author and title an article in International Development Review, Vol. 6 (December 1964), pp. 19-21; George V. Haniotis, "An Exercise in Voluntary Repatriation," International Development Review, Vol. 6 (December 1964), pp. 21-22, and subsequent correspondence in both of these publications.

10. Henderson, op. cit., indicates that almost no Taiwanese students return and the rate of return for Chinese students from all over the Orient is between 5 and 7 percent; less than one-half of Lebanese students, Iranian students and Korean students return. The reasons for non-returning vary, but include political threats and necessary exile, lack of suitable employment in the home country, and job offers in the United States.

11. See the Committee on Educational Interchange Policy, The Goals of Student Exchange, January 1955.

12. See, for example, Frederick Harbison and Charles A. Myers, Education, Manpower and Economic Growth (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964): Manpower and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965).

CHAPTER III

MEMBERS OF THE COMMUNITY AND THEIR ROLES

A. Introduction

While all studies of foreign students or the international programs of American colleges and universities have included the academic community, there are few studies of the non-academic community and its role in the international aspects of higher education and exchange. In actuality, there are a very large number of community organizations that are active in the international field, including United Nations-affiliated groups, church groups, and a number of cultural and world affairs organizations.

They play a variety of roles. Probably one of the most common but vital functions is the hosting of foreign visitors--whether short-term or longer-term. Some surveys have been made of such hosting organizations (one was just recently published by the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs[1]), but there is a lack of research on such programs. A few organizations have done self evaluations, but there appears to be no published research on the programs: administration, recruitment procedures, the participants, the nature of their activities, and so on.

As a result of this void in the literature, it was decided that this study would not only assess the nature of the host program in the Cleveland Metropolitan area, but would comprehensively survey all of the families participating in the program as hosts to foreign college and university students. The objective was to learn about the kinds of people in the community who become involved in such activities--what their perspectives on international education and exchange are, and what the nature of their relationships with foreign students is. To accomplish this, self-report data coming from a comprehensive survey was necessary, although some limited discussions with informants and active leaders in the program were held.

The presentation which follows is based on a limited questionnaire survey of new host families and participants in a large host-orientation meeting, a survey of all families hosting students in the Cleveland Council on World Affairs program in early 1964,[2] examination of some historical records, discussions with program leaders and some active participants, and interviews with some community leaders who are involved more broadly in international visitors programs in the area.

B. Who Are the Host Families?

The hosts are not representative of the entire community. They are a select group in terms of personal characteristics, background and experiences. Hosts are concentrated in the thirty-five to fifty age group and are well educated--85 percent of husbands and 80 percent of wives have had at least some college education. Over 80 percent of the husbands work in higher prestige occupations; they are executives, professionals, administrators or owners of business. Using a social-class measure developed by A. Hollingshead, one-half of the host families fit into Class I (the highest socio-economic class category), one family is in Class IV, and the remainder are in Class II and Class III. None fall in Class V.

One hypothesis tested was that foreign-born persons and members of minority groups who are more cognizant of the problems of being from a cultural out-group are more likely to participate in a program hosting foreigners.

However, only 7 percent of the husbands and half as many of the wives are foreign-born, which are both below national and metropolitan figures. But the overwhelmingly majority of host families have a number of foreign-born friends. There are very few non-whites in the host group, and the religious make-up is as follows: Jewish, 27 percent; Catholic, 10 percent, and the remainder Protestant.

Only one out of thirty has not traveled outside of the United States; all are interested in foreign travel. Just one in seven husbands and one in fourteen wives does not know a foreign language.

Apparently no similar studies have been done so there is no comparative information. However, in all probability, the profiles of the foreign student hosts in Cleveland are comparable to those of hosts in other communities. They are from above-average social class levels, with more than average education and overseas travel experience. Some implications of these facts will be discussed below.

C. Recruitment and Orientation

The families recruited into the foreign student and visitor host programs of the Council on World Affairs are organizationally active people. More than one-fourth of the hosts belong to at least eight organizations and more than one-fifth attend at least eight meetings per month.

More than one-half of these hosts state that fellow members in these organizations are foreign student hosts; that is, they are aware that people in the many groups to which they belong are in the Council on World Affairs host program. Indeed, this informal contact is the hosts major source of information--over two-thirds learned about the program from friends already participating. Very few families learn of this activity through public news media. Since the recruitment is largely through personal contacts, new hosts tend to be the same kind of people as those already involved (active persons of higher social class and educational attainment).

The families may take part in other international and foreign visitor activity prior to becoming foreign student hosts but more than two-thirds go directly into hosting students. Some families become hosts immediately after learning of the program (46 percent); while others become involved a year or longer after hearing about the program. Most hosts feel prepared for being a host to their first foreign student: 14 percent thoroughly and 71 percent adequately prepared; 11 percent inadequately prepared, and 4 percent felt thoroughly unprepared.

Although only 15 percent of the hosts felt less than adequately prepared, 82 percent do recommend some sort of orientation for new host families. When asked about their own orientation experiences, it turned out that 14 percent had none; 6 percent participated in a formal program, 11 percent in an informal group discussion, 32 percent completed orientation questionnaires, 47 percent received written materials on orientation, and 37 percent had an orientation interview.

In a special questionnaire survey to new host families, the hosts were asked to respond to the idea of host training and to orientation programs such as a one-day lecture, film, and panel discussion meeting run by the Council on World Affairs. An interesting distinction obtains in the perceptions of host families--the great majority favor orientation, while a significant number object to special training for American hosts to foreigners. One host does not support special training because it would, "...take away a natural relaxed atmosphere." Yet, the same person feels an annual orientation meeting is helpful. Another person states that, "Visitors want to see Americans as they are not after a brainwash by some U.S.I.A. type who probably would give the hosts less credit for their ability than they deserve."

A final illustration of the perceived distinction and the obvious strong connotations is seen in one respondent's reason for supporting orientation programs. She sees them as a place to meet sincere people, to hear about some successes and problems in handling foreigners, and to learn about the basic objectives and the results of the program. At the same time this person opposes training for hosts since, "Anyone who 'works' too hard at being a host generally makes the guest uncomfortable. We are to help show these students what it's really like to be an American--rules or special treatment cloud the picture." It appears that hosts either support training as a way of learning about other cultures and customs, or they oppose this as being unnecessary and attainable from literature, or they believe that training suppresses naturalism in host-foreign student relationships.

On the other hand, the great majority favor an orientation program; objections are based mostly on time considerations or on specific dissatisfactions with a particular meeting. Although there is a burgeoning of courses on non-Western culture now offered in the schools, few people such as host families for foreign students have taken such courses. It seems that some persons would be interested in an elaborated orientation or training program dealing with cultural history and differences, cross-cultural communication, and so on. Such a consideration might be seriously evaluated by community groups involved in programs of international education and exchange.[3]

D. Foreign Student Hosts' Attitudes and Experiences

The hosts surveyed in this study are largely satisfied with the program in which they participate and believe that it does serve foreign students, the community and international relations. Over 90 percent are satisfied or very satisfied with the host family program in which they are active. Seventy-seven percent are able to state positively that they plan to continue in the program after the end of the year. Only 6 percent say they will not; the remainder are uncertain.

Hosts suggest a number of changes in areas such as administrative procedures (6 percent), orientation follow-ups (13 percent), new host orientation (7 percent), screening of hosts (9 percent), printed materials (5 percent), and others. At the same time 45 percent would not like to see any changes made in the program.

An underlying assumption in many international exchange programs is that attitudinal changes are brought about which leads to greater international understanding.[4] Yet, this component of attitudinal change is still insufficiently researched. In this study of families in the community who host foreign visitors, there was an effort to measure the respondents' own assessment of the impact of the cross-cultural interaction.

Before the families met the foreign students they are hosting at the present time, 45 percent were either informed only a little or were not informed at all about the student's home country. Just over 5 percent had negative feelings about the student's home country, and 37 percent were ambivalent (the remainder had positive feelings). Over 90 percent of the hosts state that they have increased their knowledge of the student's country on the basis of their interaction with him. Additionally, 48 percent of these hosts state that their feelings toward the student's home country became more positive as a result of their relationship (there was no change in 51 percent of the cases).

The data presented above must be interpreted with great caution--first, because it is self-reported information coming from the hosts' own evaluations and second, because there is no cause-effect proof. It has been documented in other studies that increased information does not necessarily mean approval. The Gullahorns, for example, found that French hosts to American students did, indeed, increase their knowledge of the United States, but that thid did not lead directly to more favorable attitudes towards the country.[5] That is, cross-cultural contact does give opportunity for increasing knowledge and information about other cultures; however, this does not per se make one's feelings toward another culture more positive--an often-made assumption.[6] More communication and more information transmittal across cultural boundaries should be encouraged, but this is not sufficient for a society to gain approval from members of another society.[7]

All one can say with some degree of certainty is that not all American families are well-informed about other cultures, and that close interpersonal relationships with people from another culture appear to lead to greater knowledge about the visitor's culture and country.

It also appears that Americans are not favorable towards all other cultures, and that they believe that their attitudes towards a particular culture are changed by personal contact with a representative of that culture. It cannot be determined whether attitudes about a nation are a product of the person's information about it or of his reactions to the individual from the other nation with whom he has contact. It is important, however, to observe that Americans believe that they have increased their knowledge and have changed their opinions about foreign cultures as a result of personal relationships with members of those cultures. Undoubtedly some of this is due to what social psychologists call the "self-fulfilling prophesy:" One predicts that one will feel a certain way and lo and behold that is precisely how one feels. If people believe that hosting a foreign visitor will increase international understanding by giving information and creating more favorable opinions (as a two-way or reciprocal process), then it might be expected that these persons will be convinced that such has, in fact, occurred. At this point it is only possible to report the findings of this study, offer caution concerning interpretations, and suggest that further research needs to be done on the attitudinal consequences of cross-cultural relationships.

As expected, the interpersonal experiences of American families and foreign students vary considerably as to time, place, nature of event, topic of discussion, and so on. The majority of hosts spend their first meeting at home with only the immediate family present, and most have a positive impression of the experience. Yet, 30 percent are ambivalent or have unfavorable impressions of the first meeting. Generally, the American hosts think that the students' reactions are more favorable than their own. Sixteen percent of the hosts indicate language problems and 4 percent find food to be a problem. Impressions of the second meeting are more favorable--a fact which might be of relevance in the orientation of new host families. Twenty-one percent of the hosts anticipate between three and five visits with the foreign student during the year, while 24 percent anticipate at least twelve visits during the year. Almost all hosts plan to keep in touch with the foreign student after his or her departure.

It was stated that a number of hosts are ambivalent in their feelings about the first meeting with the foreign student. The following social-psychological interpretation is offered as an attempt to explain this reaction.

Ambivalent means neither positive nor negative or both positive and negative. The host's ambivalence might be induced by inconsistencies in the behavior of the foreign student, discrepancies between the host's preconceptions and actual behavior, or a lack of preconceived notions by which the host is able to judge the actual situation. It is hypothesized that the last factor is significant. This comes from the responses given by the hosts in the survey to two broad questions: 1) What do you think should be the role of the individual American host for foreign students? 2) What do you feel are the objectives of the host family program for foreign students?

Although hosts receive some orientation and two-thirds of them feel adequately prepared for their roles as hosts, the responses to these two questions indicate that a significant number of hosts have not thought about their role and the program's objectives, and/or they have not decided clearly what their role or the program's objectives ought to be. This is further revealed in the opinions of new hosts who want orientation to help clarify program objectives and training to better outline the host role. All this should not, perhaps, be surprising, but it suggests that ambivalent attitudes may be generated when the host family is not clear about the objectives of the host program or its own role as host to foreign students. Some implications for program planners are apparent.

The responses of hosts to the two questions above are of three broad types. The first is the service orientation which is illustrated by several sub-types: 1) compensatory--"...in view of the poor living accommodations which most of the foreign students are faced with...;" 2) all-embracing--"The host family... can also act as a morale builder, counselor in matters of everyday life, and means of referral to official advisors in serious matters." Another person responded merely by saying "dogooding." 3) Intimacy--"...afford opportunity for the student to know Americans on a personal, home environment basis. Without such a program it is quite possible for a student to return to his country without ever meeting Americans outside an institutional setting... provides a student with a family who cares about him and provides, consequently, a supporting relationship for him."

The second kind of orientation is towards information-transmittal. This is illustrated by ethnocentric statements such as, "to show them the best way of life in the world," and factual and interpretative comments like, "assist in housing, language classes for wives; acquaint student with many community resources: transportation, museums, parks, newspapers, shopping...to interpret America as we see it to the student."

The third type of orientation is, broadly, the betterment of international relations. In most cases this is stated as a one-way process of giving the foreign visitor an opportunity for seeing Americans, thus improving international relations. A few hosts stress the two-way flow of information and the mutuality of the relationship. An illustration of the latter is, "To enable us to understand our foreign friends. To enable our foreign students to understand us. To promote the greater cause of world peace through understanding one another; that our basic similarities will serve to unite us."

To summarize, three types of orientations of American hosts to foreign students have been suggested: service, information-transmittal, and international relations betterment. These are conceptual distinctions. Of course, responses given by the hosts to the questions about their host roles and the host program objectives frequently include all of these perspectives, which are closely related.

A generalization which emerges from the responses of more than one hundred and forty families is that the great majority view their host roles from the perspective of what they contribute to the relationship--directly and indirectly. When hosts comment on what they get out of the relationship it is when they are asked why they became hosts; it is not as part of their perceived role or program objectives. The host role and the objectives of the host program is mostly seen in terms of what Americans give to, rather than what they get from, the relationships established with foreign students. This probably reflects the lack of emphasis on the contributions which foreign visitors make in the face-to-face relationships they establish with Americans. Perhaps orientation for Americans might specifically incorporate some perspective on what members of the host culture get from, as well as what they give to, the relationships they establish with foreign visitors.

The hosts are asked to indicate the nature of the gain for both themselves and the foreign students. Seventy percent said that the experience gives the host family greater insights and understanding of other people and their backgrounds. The hosts feel that the foreign students gain insight into American culture and family life (53 percent), and gain through a personal relationship which prevents loneliness (26 percent). These themes are expanded upon when the hosts give their interpretation of the over-all objectives of cross-cultural educational exchange programs. Twenty-four percent stress improving international relations, and 32 percent mention understanding differences, reducing prejudices and misconceptions (while 32 percent emphasize the educational aspects of the programs).

Thus, it becomes clear that hosts define their own participation in such international educational programs in a more narrow and service-oriented perspective. At the same time, they emphasize the international, reciprocal and mutual-understanding themes in the programs and the benefits the participants can derive from them. The implications of this observation relate to the above commentary concerning the orientation of Americans, the possibility of cross-cultural training or education for Americans, and the nature of the relationships between members of the host culture and foreign visitors.

More than a decade ago Buchanan and Cantril stated in a UNESCO study that to make a citizen of any country an international citizen of the world it is necessary to: enlarge his own perceived world, bring this world into perspective, improve his facilities for communication and perception, give him an opportunity to act, and create opportunities for common action.[8] There is an indication that the American host family-foreign student relationship can contribute towards these objectives.

E. Community Participation and Involvement in International Education and Exchange

The Cleveland Council on World Affairs is the primary organization concerned with international visitors such as doctors, college and university students and their wives, and short-term guests. The Council has a professional staff and over 800 volunteers in the Cleveland area. Its activities include locating housing; hosting and driving for tours; running the International Student Center, speakers bureau and social and language programs for doctors and students and their wives; providing host families and hospitality, and attempting job placement for foreign students. Also, the Council on World Affairs provides world affairs discussion groups and seminars for Clevelanders, operates a junior world affairs program in the public schools, and offers public seminars and lectures on international events and world affairs. Although participants who work on Cleveland Council on World Affairs programs are not formal representatives of other community groups, the Council staff and volunteers work with other organizations and recruit volunteers, hosts and members from the broader community. The various programs in international education and cultural exchange are mutually reinforcing and they provide the opportunity for a person working in one area to become interested in another; that is, world affairs discussion participants develop interests in hosting foreign students and so on. While the formal program of the Council on World Affairs is concerned with greeting new foreign students and making assignments to host families in the community, there are informal host family operations in which students and families come together through the college or university foreign student advisor or faculty.

In addition to college students, during 1963 there were 57 foreign doctors at Cleveland Metropolitan Hospital and 100 visiting foreign scholars at Western Reserve University - a number that rose to 114 in 1964. Other groups of foreign visitors include: approximately thirty high school students living with suburban families under the auspices of the American Field Service; foreign visitors brought to Cleveland by the Cleveland International Program for Youth Leaders and Social Workers; foreign visiting teachers; international visitors of the Cleveland Welfare Federation; short-term visitors sponsored by various federal government programs, and foreign participants in industrial training programs operated by individual corporations or through AISEC--an international exchange association for persons in business training.

The Cleveland Council on World Affairs was founded by prominent business and industrial leaders, and such activity has been institutionalized in these quarters of the community for over a generation. While contacts between university and business persons are limited, the business community participates in various world affairs discussion groups, the world affairs programs in the schools, and fund-raising. Wives of prominent community leaders are active in the educational and cultural exchange programs in Cleveland. Some few companies have foreign trainees and cooperate in broader visitor-service programs. While there appears to be more involvement of the top business and community leaders in Cleveland's international and world affairs activities than there is in some other cities, it is still a modest role. In the few specific efforts by foreign student programmers to elicit the cooperation of industrialists--such as summer job placement--the results have been negligible. Greater participation by the business community is an objective of some international visitor programmers around the country. Some universities are offering courses for American business persons preparing for overseas work; other colleges and universities are recruiting business establishments as hosts to foreign students. While the Cleveland Council on World Affairs has generated considerable interest among the top economic and community leadership, their involvement in the international aspects of higher education in Cleveland is limited.

Although the participation of industrial and business leaders as corporation representatives is slight, it has already been demonstrated that families functioning as hosts to foreign students are disproportionately recruited from the upper income and occupational levels. Some critical observers note that foreign visitors to this country are heavily insulated from all but the upper social levels and are not exposed to a cross-section of the country. Most programmers acknowledge the very significant under-representation of Negro and working-class hosts in community programs. This study merely documents or substantiates these estimates.

Both labor leaders and international visitor programmers interviewed in this study criticize programs which seek to expose foreign visitors to working-class families for the sake of exposure. It is noted that average middle-class white Americans have relatively little social intercourse with American working-class and Negro families, and that an air of superficiality is evident when foreigners are merely shown populations other than those involved in hosting programs. At the same time, it should be noted that union and labor groups have hosted foreign visitors and there are formal trade union exchange and training programs. There is a challenge for those already-established groups to encourage participation from their membership in the community-wide international organizations. Rather than just bringing in representatives of labor or Negro organizations to speak to foreign students and visitors, it is also suggested that host organizations make a greater effort to extend their communications and recruitment beyond the usual social groups. Recruitment of foreign student hosts depends largely upon informal contacts among persons of comparable social class, occupational and educational background. To enlarge the representation of the community necessitates an active outreach to other segments of the population, in an effort to include a greater variety of Americans in meaningful cross-cultural relationships.

F. Implications and Conclusions

This chapter presents survey data showing that the host family program attracts primarily persons of upper socio-economic levels with advanced education. Furthermore, recruitment depends mostly upon interpersonal contact. The implications are pointed out, and some suggestions are made about the desirability of broadening the diversity of participants in the community. Specifically, broader participation might be accomplished by encouragement from non-represented groups to their members, and active outreach on the part of international host organizations is indicated.

Hosts in the foreign student program are satisfied with their involvement and are convinced of the impact of such cross-cultural experiences upon themselves, the student, the community, and international understanding. Many hosts believe that the experience has induced changes in their own attitudes. Most hosts support the need for some orientation before their participation, and there is a suggestion that program objectives and host roles might be more closely outlined.

Interaction between the educational institutions and the business community concerning international aspects of education and exchange is minimal. Participation by industrial and business leaders is modest, although the possibilities of involvement are considerable. The situation in Cleveland is critically affected by the relationships between the colleges and the universities and the Cleveland Council on World Affairs which assumes responsibility for non-academic programming for foreign students. The Council on World Affairs has achieved business participation in some of its programs, but not very significantly in educational and cultural exchange programs.

Greater involvement of the business community in the international aspects of the colleges and university might be accomplished through more direct relationships with the institutions. International business training, adult educational programs, and other aspects of the educational program of the colleges and universities are relevant to the business community. Additional interest in an international student center or other activities needs to be specifically generated. The broadening horizons of American college and university students (the future community members, business leaders, etc.) and the international interests among them is examined in the next chapter.

Footnotes

1. See, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Survey of Hospitality Committees Serving Foreign Students, 1964, May 1965.

2. There was no sampling: all new hosts and others attending an all-day orientation meeting in the fall of 1963 were sent questionnaires. Similarly, all families hosting foreign students through the Council on World Affairs program in early 1964 were included in the survey, with a response rate in excess of 90 percent.

3. Such a program has been explored in the past few years by community and university persons in Cleveland; however, no program has been established or is now planned. A major problem is financial. A grant from the State Department or other governmental unit might be proposed to develop a pilot program of university-sponsored training of community persons in cross-cultural communication. Such an idea is supported by the conclusions of a recent study of foreign visitors and their communication experiences with Americans: Bryant M. Wedge, Visitors to the United States and How They See Us (Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1965).

4. On the matter of attitudinal change stemming from international exchange experiences, see, Herbert C. Kelman, "Changing Attitudes Through International Activities," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 18 (1962), pp. 68-87.

5. John T. and Jeanne E. Gullahorn, American Students in France, mimeographed, pp. 188, 214-215.

6. This assumption has become the rationale behind some of the Government-supported cross-cultural programs. See, for example, the Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the United States House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs, titled, Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive, 1963. Not only is the proposition offered in government circles that cross-cultural contact will bring America friends and develop pro-American feelings among foreigners, but this is picked up by writers on the exchange programs. This is illustrated by Will Lissner's column entitled, "Foreign Students Won Over to U.S. by Family Living," New York Times, June 28, 1964, p. 1.

7. On the matter of cross-cultural communication and knowledge of others' cultures, see David K. Berlo, The Process of Communication (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960); Ina Corinne Brown, Understanding Other Cultures (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963).

8. William Buchanan and Hadley Cantril, How Nations See Each Other (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1953), pp. 98-100.

CHAPTER IV

AMERICAN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

A. Introduction

The studies of American students are very considerable in number, in large measure due to students being accessible to social researchers. However, research into the international attitudes and experiences of college and university students is sparse, and studies of American-foreign student interaction are few. The objective in this study was to assess the international orientation of American students: their interest in study abroad, work abroad, work in the Peace Corp or other agency; their interest in other cultures and international relations; their attitudes towards educational exchange of foreign students and faculty; and their attitudes on international technical assistance, the United Nations, and so on. In addition, there was a need for further research into the nature of American-foreign student interaction in general and to understand the dimensions of such social relations in the community under study in particular.

Highlights from the survey will be presented in this chapter. Although the focus is largely on interaction and actual experience, some attitudinal findings are presented since these are interpreted as having relevance for the development of educational and non-academic programs at the institutions and in the community.

B. Interaction With Foreign Students

The data here discussed are obtained from a survey of three hundred and seventy-six American college and university students attending Cleveland area schools at the end of the 1963-1964 year.[1] Interviews with students, program advisors to the International Student Center, and school administrators offered additional insights into the attitudes and the social relations of the American college and university students.

In a study by Goldsen and others done at Cornell University, it was found that American students who were socially active and well integrated into campus life were more likely to have more interaction with foreign students than were the deviant, badly integrated students.[2] Among the significant items influencing this relationship was being housed with and having physical access to foreign students. At the same time, in a recent study at Indiana University, Shearer has shown that proximity to foreign students is, in itself, not a causal factor, although it is relevant. Rather, Americans living in the same dormitory with foreign students still differ in interaction patterns depending upon personal characteristics (major in school, part of country that the student comes from, etc.) and personality characteristics.[3]

Table 4.1 reveals that two-thirds of the American students are not living

TABLE 4.1

AMERICAN STUDENT CONTACT WITH FOREIGN STUDENTS, IF ANY, IN THEIR BUILDING
(In Percentages)

Amount of Contact		No Foreign Students In Building	Don't Know If Foreign Students In Building	Total Number
Never	0.5	63.3	5.5	365
Rarely	7.1			
Occasionally	10.1			
Often	11.2			
Foreign student roommate(s)	0.3			

in a building with foreign students. Better than one-fifth do live in such a situation and interact with the foreign student occasionally or often. More than one-quarter of the students included in the study are married and the same proportion live in college or university-sponsored housing or dormitories. With the increase in the number of students living in dormitories, perhaps the proportion living in physical proximity to foreign students will be increased. This is particularly likely in the graduate house or residence center operated jointly by Case Institute of Technology and Western Reserve University.

Another source of contact between students comes in organizational activity. It is interesting to note in Table 4.2 that more students say they do not know if foreign students belong to the same organizations as they do (22 percent), than do those who state positively that there are no foreign students in their organizations (21 percent). Of the American students who belong to organizations in which there are foreign students, one in seven never or rarely interacts with these foreign students, while two-fifths interact often or occasionally with them.

TABLE 4.2

AMERICAN STUDENT CONTACT WITH FOREIGN STUDENTS IN ORGANIZATIONS
(In Percentages)

Amount of Contact		No Foreign Students In Organization	Don't Know If Foreign Students In Organization	Total Number
Never	5.9	21.1	22.4	322
Rarely	9.9			
Occasionally	19.3			
Often	20.5			

As revealed in Chapter One, the foreign students comprise a small proportion of the total student population at the colleges and universities in the Cleveland area, a percentage not at great variance with the national statistics. Yet, it would be expected that most Americans would attend classes in which there were foreign students. As shown in Table 4.3 the great majority have had foreign students in their classes in the past and were in classes with foreign students at the time of the survey. Of those in this category, the proportion is evenly divided between those who do and those who do not interact with these foreign students outside of class.

TABLE 4.3

AMERICAN STUDENT RECENT CONTACT WITH FOREIGN STUDENTS IN AND OUT OF CLASSES
(In Percentages)

Contact Outside Class		No Foreign Students In Classes	Don't Know If Foreign Students In Classes	Total Number
Never	11.5	28.5	9.9	365
Rarely	18.1			
Occasionally	23.0			
Often	8.8			
Foreign Students In Classes In The Past	90.6	4.3	5.1	373

In addition to academic-centered contact, Americans were asked to discuss their non-academic contact with foreign students. Almost 30 percent of the students in the sample are married. About 16 percent of the single students have dated a foreign student.[4] Overall, less than [illegible] percent of the American students have no contact with foreign students--as presented in Table 4.4.

TABLE 4.4

SUMMARY OF AMERICAN STUDENT CONTACT AND ACTIVITY WITH FOREIGN STUDENTS
(In Percentages)

Number of Foreign Students Personally In Contact With		Total = 369
None	19.8	
One or two	32.8	
Three or four	23.6	
Five through ten	14.9	
More than ten	8.9	

Activities With Foreign Student	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Often	Total
Studying	51.7	22.3	19.0	7.0	273
Movies, theater or concerts	61.6	15.7	17.5	5.2	268
Dating	78.3	10.5	9.0	2.2	267
Have lunch or coffee	25.1	19.9	33.0	22.0	291

American Students Attitudes Toward Foreign Students		Total = 295
Among your best friends	13.6	
A good friend	30.2	
Just a person to speak to	56.3	

American Students Feelings About Losing Touch With Foreign Student		Total = 288
Very badly	9.4	
Fairly badly	24.3	
Not badly at all	39.6	
Not at all	26.7	

Dating is the least common activity, while lunch or coffee together is a regular experience for well over one-half of the American students attending Cleveland colleges and universities.

A more accurate measure of the strength of the relationships reveals that for almost 14 percent, a foreign student is among their best friends, while for another 30 percent a foreigner is a good friend. More than one-third of the American students with foreign student friends would feel badly if they were to lose contact with the foreign student. This would appear to be an indication that American students not only interact with foreign students, but they establish close and meaningful relationships.

However, the total picture presents something of a paradox. On the other hand, a sizeable proportion of American students indicate strong feelings of friendship for foreign students; yet, the proportion engaging in more personal activities--dating, studying together, living together, attending theaters together--is small. A majority belong to organizations in which there are foreign students. Yet, only a very small proportion of American students have had any relationship whatsoever with the International Student Group and Center which is maintained for foreign and American students in the Cleveland area by the Cleveland Council on World Affairs.[5]

C. International Student Group and Center

The International Student Group (ISG) is a voluntary membership organization of American and foreign students and some non-students. Its membership is drawn from the schools in the metropolitan area, but its support and direction comes from the Cleveland Council on World Affairs. The Council also assumes administrative responsibility for the International Center--formerly a building and currently a store-front facility--which houses the activities of the International Student Group. It is physically located near Western Reserve University and Case Institute of Technology, where the majority of foreign students are registered.

A description of the membership of the International Student Group makes the most sense when compared to the larger student population on selected characteristics. There are 119 foreign members of the ISG, 65 of whom are students. This constitutes about one-quarter of Cleveland's foreign students. Compared to the total 1963 foreign student population, males are slightly under represented in the ISG (74 percent compared to 79 percent in total enrollments of foreign students). ISG foreign student members are disproportionately single, and are drawn from the graduate level in numbers disproportionate to the total.

In the ISG, Canada, South America (no members) and East Asia (Japan) are under represented in membership compared to the number of students from those countries. Southeast Asia is somewhat over represented, but it is Northern and Western Europe that is significantly over represented (21 percent in the ISG; 6 percent in total foreign student population). Other regions and countries are approximately equal in their representation in the total population and in the ISG. It is not surprising, perhaps, that almost none of the foreign students at Baldwin-Wallace College, which is on the opposite side of the metropolitan area from the International Student Center, belong to the ISG. It is more striking that not one of the twenty-one foreign students at John Carroll University belong to the ISG.[6] Case Institute of Technology is slightly over represented and Western Reserve University slightly under represented among the members, as is Fenn College.

While some conclusions may be drawn from these comparative figures, they do not convey the full picture of attendance or use of the International Student Group and Center. An earlier study by the Cleveland Council on World Affairs showed that there was some resentment among foreign student attenders when attendance was contingent upon membership.[7] Students stayed away rather than become members. At the present time, non-members are not systematically excluded from participation, although membership is solicited. Consequently, the membership characteristics do not give a total picture of the participants. ISG foreign members are more likely to be single, graduate students, women, from Northern and Western Europe and Southeast Asia than would be expected based on the characteristics of the total foreign student population.

The international centers at several universities (for example, Stanford University where a study was made in 1962[8]) attract a majority of foreign students on a regular (at least weekly) basis. This degree of participation can be attributed to the permanence of the facilities and the informal social outlet that these centers provide.

In contrast, the International Student Center in Cleveland has an off-campus rented facility which has moved three times in as many years, and is largely used for more formal programs. These factors also explain the participation of non-student foreign members (student wives, trainees, post-doctoral fellows, employed persons) who are more likely to be attracted to more structured and formal activities located off the campus. Development of an on-campus facility for informal use would almost certainly change the character of the Center and alter the nature of the participants. Since three-quarters of the ISG are foreigners, and the ISG and Center is operated by non-university community persons through the Council on World Affairs, it is especially important that the role of the Center be viewed in relation to the program involving foreign students in the community--such as the host family arrangements.

In addition to the foreign members, there are 38 American members of the ISG, 23 of whom are college or university students. The American student members are largely undergraduate women, single, and live in university housing. Two-thirds of all American ISG members are female, accounted for in part by non-students such as nurses and school teachers.

A full tabulation of the International Student Group appears in the Appendix; however, a summary will provide some base for conclusions. Of the 157 dues-paying members of the ISG, one-quarter are Americans and three-quarters are foreigners; specifically, American students (15 percent), American non-students (10 percent), foreign students (41 percent), foreign non-students (33 percent). Most members are single; most Americans are female and most foreigners are male.

Part of the questions in the survey of the 376 American college and university students focused on the International Student Group and Center. In fact, there is a curious apparent paradox. American students are interested in international affairs. Some plan careers which will take them abroad. Most students want to visit outside of the United States, and many have already done so. Foreign language training is very common. Yet, the overwhelming majority of the American students have not heard of the ISG. It has already been shown that out of more than 20,000 American students, only 23 belong to the ISG. In one national survey, 83 percent of the participating universities indicated that the institutions encouraged and formed regional and area groups emphasizing affiliation of American and foreign students.[9] In the Cleveland area, the institutions themselves have not encouraged such organizational formation. The one group which might fulfill the function of affiliating American and foreign students is non-university sponsored and operated and exists off-campus. Furthermore, the group is not integrated into other college and university activities, and as the survey demonstrates, its very existence is not well known among the American students.

While American students do not participate in the ISG, 78 percent favor the idea of a distinct joint organization of American and foreign students and 39 percent favor a separate physical facility or building for such an organization. Just over two-thirds of the American students believe that an international student organization should have an equal proportion of American and foreign students.

American students support the idea of an international student organization because, "People tend to remain with people known to them, who are familiar. Structured opportunities to meet different kinds of people are important to broaden all of our horizons and understanding." More than one-half of the students affirm the desirability for such an organization with reasons which stress intercultural and international understanding, friendship, and contacts. On the other hand, a small number of Americans feel that having such an organization would tend to increase the isolation of foreign students, who should be integrated into campus life through other existing organizations.

In summary, the Americans are interested in international affairs and there are no existing organizational structures concerned with international activities to any extent. The potential for greater involvement of Americans whose interest would lead them in the direction of the ISG is obvious.

Comments from the small group of American student ISG members confirm that publicity is a major weakness in the current program. Compatible with the findings from the survey of American students is the view which favors the expansion of the ISG into a broader international club, and as one student urged, "More contact with Americans; move activities more out to the campus: folk-dancing events in the Student Union, nationality nights and language table in the Union." While the American members of the ISG vary in their preferences for various activities, most urge that the present program be enlarged and be better integrated into the college and university community. Non-members indicate broad international interests of the kind that often are channeled into an international relations or anthropology club, foreign language club, or international student discussion-social organization. Such interests might be expressed through an International Student Group and Center in Cleveland, but would require a restructuring and reorienting of the group. A college and university-supported international student organization which is well integrated into the educational life of the institution appears to best meet the interests and needs of the American students.

To summarize, if the Center is another service for foreign students provided by a community organization, then it must be thought of in those terms. If, on the other hand, it is an integral part of the college and university milieu, then it should be encouraged by the institution--in terms of organizational recognition, faculty and staff advisors and program assistance, and facilities--perhaps, as suggested by American students, in the student union. The interests of American students in international activities are shown in the next section.

D. Perspectives and Orientations Toward International Activities and Exchanges

The burgeoning of international programs at American colleges and universities was discussed in Chapter One, where the trend towards increasing international exchanges also was presented. A number of studies and surveys have summarized the developments and various aspects of the international involvements of American schools and American students and faculty.[10] Yet, very little research has focused on the perspectives or the orientations of the students themsleves. In one study, Blau found that there was a relationship between domestic and international attitudes; that is, politically liberal students favored greater international cooperation.[11] A statistical analysis of two attitudinal measures in the Cleveland survey substantiates this relationship--liberal students manifest greater support for the United Nations and for international cooperation.

Additional focus in the study of American students was on their views on international educational exchange and their interest in personal international activities. A study of attitudes lends insights not only into how people feel about particular issues, but how the variety of attitudes fit together into a perspective or an orientation.[12]

As seen in Table 4.5, the support for educational exchange programs is overwhelming. Almost all American students feel that Fulbright programs which bring foreign scholars to this country and send American professors abroad should continue. Students also approve of programs which enable American students to go abroad, although only 11 percent are committed to an overseas educational experience themselves.

Fifty-seven percent of the Americans do not believe that American colleges and universities should have a quota system for the admission of foreign students,

TABLE 4.5

AMERICAN STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD FOREIGN STUDENT AND EXCHANGE PROGRAMS
(In Percentages)

	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know	Total
U.S. schools should have a percentage quota of students from foreign countries.	21.2	57.1	21.7	368
Admission standards for foreign students should differ from those used for U.S. students	36.0	53.0	11.0	372
Standards of academic performance (examinations, term papers, lab work) should differ for foreign students as contrasted to American students.	9.1	85.5	5.4	373
Foreign students should be required to return to their home countries after completing their studies here.	21.7	59.8	18.5	373
Junior year abroad and other school programs outside the United States for American students should be continued	96.8	1.1	2.2	372
Fulbright and other programs which send American faculty abroad should be continued	97.3	0.8	1.9	373
Fulbright and other programs which bring foreign faculty members to American schools should be continued.	96.8	1.3	1.9	373

and 60 percent do not believe that a foreign student should be required to return to his home country upon the completion of his studies. At the same time, American students are less willing to accept differential admission standards for foreign students (53 percent are unwilling) or different standards of academic performance (85 percent are not in favor). The traits which emerge are: support for educational exchange and willingness to accept foreign students, while rejecting preferential treatment of students from other countries once they are accepted into an American institution. The assumption is that this second factor reflects the attitude that foreign students should be integrated into the college or university and not treated differently in academic matters. Because of the support for an international student organization which would involve foreign students with American students, the conclusion is that American students favor full integration of foreign students into all aspects of campus life.

American students are internationally experienced to an extent which is surprising, even in view of Cleveland's proximity to the Canadian border. Seventy-one percent of the students in the sample survey have been outside the United States. Ninety percent of the students know or have studied a foreign language. As shown in Table 4.6, the great majority of students expect to travel outside the United States in the future. Eleven percent are planning to study abroad, while another 28 percent are undecided. Sixteen percent plan to live outside this country for some length of time. There is no way of determining the outcome of the students' plans to apply for overseas work with an agency such as the Peace Corps. Nevertheless, the significance of the 7 percent who say they will is apparent if one projects hypothetically and envisions 7 percent of the more than four million college and university students applying for such service.

A last item on student interest in overseas experiences reveals that 10 percent intend to choose a career which will involve work outside of the United States. This, perhaps more than any other single item, suggests the importance of the international components of education in the minds of college and university students. One in ten students presumably hopes to have elements in his

TABLE 4.6

AMERICAN STUDENT EXPECTATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITY
(In Percentages)

	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total
I expect to travel outside of the United States in the future.	84.4	2.4	13.2	371
I expect to obtain some formal schooling outside the United States in the future.	10.9	61.1	28.0	368
I expect to apply to the Peace Corps or other voluntary agencies for temporary overseas service (civilian).	7.3	74.9	17.8	370
I expect to live outside the United States for some length of time in the future	15.7	50.8	33.5	370
I expect to choose a career which will involve work outside the United States.	9.5	62.2	28.4	370

educational training which will be of help in his occupation outside of the United States. This explains the growing interest in non-Western culture courses, foreign languages, and some of the courses which emphasize comparative analysis.[13]

The portrait which emerges from this overview of American students' attitudes and expectations is one of substantial international interest in and support for international exchanges, and a significant amount of personal involvement or projection into international activity.[14]

E. Implications and Conclusions

The observation noted immediately above suggests a local college and university interest in international aspects of higher education. At the same time, Americans do not involve themselves in the International Student Group and Center, and there are no competing organizations to capture the international interest manifest by the students. The implication is a reinforcement of the opinion expressed by some of the students that a broader-in-scope international student organization be developed which would provide a forum for international discussions and educational as well as social programs, and which would be an outlet for student interests in the entire range of international activities. There are, of course, further implications and conclusions which might affect the academic administration: student abroad programs, additional course offerings in comparative and non-Western areas, and so on.

What is suggested is a gap between the existing university structures and emphasis and the interests apparently held by the American students. This is not only true with regard to the fact that the International Student Center is providing virtually no outlet of expression and interest for American students. Additionally, comments volunteered by students suggest considerable interest in study abroad and more international emphasis on campus which is at variance from the present local institutional milieus.

As far as American-foreign student interaction patterns are concerned, the evidence suggests that there are a considerable number of contacts which are channeled through a variety of means other than the International Student Center. The data suggest, as do findings in other studies, that American students who interact with foreign students are more active participators in campus life--that is, they belong to organizations, date, and participate in extracurricular activities.[15] If the interaction between American and foreign students is facilitated through organizational activity rather than mere contact in the classroom or in residences, then it is highly relevant to examine the need for an international student organization and an on-campus facility. This survey has demonstrated American student interest, but the involvement potential has not been realized.

Footnotes

1. Sampling questions are discussed in the Appendix.

2. Rose K. Goldsen, Edward A. Suchman, and Robin M. Williams, "Factors Associated with the Development of Cross-Cultural Social Interaction," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 12 (1956), pp. 26-32.

3. Roberta Shearer, "A Comparative Study of American Graduate Student Friends of Foreign Students," Ed.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1965.

4. Several studies of foreign student-American student dating demonstrate that this is an experience of relative adjustment for the foreigner. See R.O. Blood and S.O. Nicholson, "The Experiences of Foreign Students in Dating American Women," Marriage and Family Living, Vol. 24 (August 1962), pp. 241-250. "The Attitudes of American Men and Women Toward International Dating," Marriage and Family Living, Vol. 24 (February 1962), pp. 35-41; "International Dating Experiences of American Women Students," Marriage and Family Living, Vol. 24 (May 1962), pp. 129-136.

5. All American student members of the International Student Group (23) were intentionally included in the survey. However, even including them, only 7 percent of the total in the sample have participated at all in the International Student Group.

6. In 1964-1965 one foreign student at John Carroll University belonged to the ISG. However, the figures for 1964-1965 contained so many cases where information was not known, that tabulations would have been misleading (age and academic status was not known for over one-half of the ISG members, marital status was unknown for almost one-quarter, etc.). As a result, data on ISG members for 1963-1964 was used in the analysis.

7. Cleveland Council on World Affairs, Report of the Community Relations Committee on the Role of the International Center, mimeographed, 1962.

8. Stanford University, Survey on the Use of the International Center, mimeographed, May 1962.

9. See Paul A. Bloland, "Developing American-Foreign Student Relationships," paper presented at the American Personnel and Guidance Association meetings, Boston, Massachusetts, April 10, 1963.

10. For an overview of such involvement, see Edward W. Weidner, The World Role of Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962).

11. Peter M. Blau, "Orientation of College Students Toward International Relations," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 59 (November 1953), pp. 205-214.

12. On the contribution of attitudes research in cross-cultural relations, see Eugene Jacobson, Hideya Kumata, and Jeanne E. Gullahorn, "Cross-Cultural Contributions to Attitude Research," Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 24 (Summer 1960), pp. 205-223.

13. On this theme, see two special issues of The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science; "The Rising Demand for International Education," May 1961; "The Non-Western World in Higher Education," November 1964.

14. One of the more interesting illustrations of substantial interest and commitment to international activities among college and university students is the National Student Association pilot project at the Universities of Minnesota, Illinois and Wisconsin. There is an internship program for undergraduates with activities on and off campus in the international field; including work with international community groups, foreign student and exchange programs, and so on. See National Student Association, The Student Project for International Responsibility (mimeographed, n.d.).

15. Goldsen, et.al., op.cit.; Shearer, op.cit.

CHAPTER V

AMERICAN COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACULTY

A. Introduction

Some American professors have for a long period of time obtained at least part of their own education at foreign universities and have engaged in research and scholarship outside of the United States. However, there has been a substantial increase in such activity in the past few years, stimulated by the post World War II government-sponsored programs such as the Fulbright-Hays Act. At the same time there has developed an emphasis upon non-Western studies and comparative materials, and the new emphasis in fields such as anthropology and international relations. Hence, the current generation of American academic professionals are enveloped in the national milieu of interest in international education.

Few studies of professors have been done. Fewer still have inquired into professors' experiences and attitudes regarding this international activity--be it foreign students, foreign scholars, American students or faculty abroad, non-Western curricular emphasis, cross-cultural research collaboration or professional participation, or technical assistance. This study has included professors as one of the populations surveyed and findings are presented in this chapter.

B. Faculty Experiences and Perspectives on Foreign Students

The survey of faculty at the several colleges and universities included 213 persons representing a broad range of professional fields, interests, and backgrounds.

As shown in Table 5.1, the professors differ only slightly from the American students in their views on quotas and admission standards for foreign students; faculty are less willing to set quotas but at the same time are also less willing to employ different admission standards. More than one-half of the faculty advocate special tutoring for foreign students, but only 9 percent support special examinations, 22 percent agree that professors should use special

TABLE 5.1

AMERICAN FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD TREATMENT OF FOREIGN STUDENTS
(In Percentages)

	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know	Total
United States schools should have a percentage quota of students from foreign countries.	18.4	59.9	21.7	212
Admission standards for foreign students should differ from those used for United States students.	28.6	63.4	8.0	213
Foreign students should be given the same exams as those given to their American classmates.	85.0	8.9	6.1	213
Teachers should show special consideration in grading the exams of foreign students.	21.6	72.8	5.6	213
Teachers should give special tutoring to foreign students in their classes who are having trouble with course work.	53.8	30.0	16.2	210
In grading foreign students at the end of the semester, teachers should show special consideration.	13.6	80.3	6.1	213

examination grading procedures for foreign students, and 14 percent believe in special consideration for foreign students in final grading. The composite picture suggests that a substantial number of faculty members do treat foreign students specially in one way or another in the academic process.

The questions about academic treatment of foreign students are relevant for most of the faculty, since 81 percent have such students in class. Table 5.2 presents the findings on the nature of faculty-foreign student contact. Almost one-fifth of the faculty are academic advisors to foreign students, the same approximate proportion interact with foreign students in extracurricular activities and the same ratio obtains for other social contact, such as hosting students at home.

TABLE 5.2

AMERICAN FACULTY CONTACT WITH FOREIGN STUDENTS

	Percentage	Total
Students in your classes.	80.8	213
As academic advisor to foreign students.	23.9	213
Tutoring foreign students who were not in any of your classes.	6.1	213
In extracurricular activities.	25.8	213
In foreign student-host family program.	8.5	213
Other social contact.	22.5	213

Professors who do have foreigners in their classes believe that they are more highly motivated and more interested in their subjects than American students. However, they judge American students to be superior to foreign students in examinations, written work and class participation, as shown in Table 5.3. One explanation for faculty special treatment of foreign students is that they believe that such students are strongly motivated and interested, but are not as able to perform. Thus, the professors are willing to be flexible in evaluating and working with foreign students. Informal conversations with faculty at several colleges and universities around the country support this hypothesis. At the same time, it is important to note that 11 percent of the professors rate foreign students poorly on verbal expression and 16 percent

TABLE 5.3

AMERICAN FACULTY EVALUATION AND RATING OF FOREIGN STUDENTS
(In Percentages)

	Same	Foreign students superior	American students superior	Total
Class participation	51.6	8.8	38.4	159
Written work	32.3	12.0	53.8	158
Interest in subject	56.3	33.8	8.8	160
Examinations	43.3	9.6	45.9	157
Motivation in regard to school and study	41.3	47.5	10.0	160

FACULTY RATING OF FOREIGN STUDENTS
(In Percentages)

	Don't know	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Verbal expression	1.5	6.2	37.3	45.3	10.6	161
Writing ability	1.5	5.6	36.7	41.0	15.5	161
Comprehension	1.5	11.7	53.1	31.5	3.1	162

state that foreign students are poor in their writing ability. This reinforces the conclusion based on the surveys of the foreign students themselves, emphasizing the importance of English language training.

Although the professors indicate that foreign students have academic problems, they overwhelmingly--94 percent--favor bringing foreign students to the United States in the professor's field of study, and the percentage supporting the idea in general is even higher. Sixty percent of the faculty who generally favor bringing foreign students to American colleges and universities believe that the number of such students should be increased. The remainder either think the present number is right or are ambivalent. Some faculty are concerned about the need to bolster the educational establishments in other countries, about the language and academic qualifications of the foreign students, about the need to reserve American institutions for the burgeoning number of Americans who want to attend college or university, and so on.

Professors offer a broad range of reasons for favoring the bringing of foreign students to the United States. As evidenced in Table 5.4, 44 percent of the professors believe that the most important reason for bringing foreign students to this country is that it contributes to international understanding; while 25 percent stress that it is of value to the student. Other primary reasons given are: has value to the foreign student's home country (8 percent), contributes to campus life (6 percent), fulfills obligations of colleges and universities (4 percent), assists American foreign policy (2 percent), and enhances the prestige of the college or university (1 percent).

The professors believe that there is a considerable amount of interaction between American and foreign students on their campus: 15 percent believe that

TABLE 5.4

AMERICAN FACULTY JUDGEMENT ON THE MOST IMPORTANT REASON FOR ENROLLING FOREIGN STUDENTS IN AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

	Percentage	Total = 210
It fulfills the obligations of U.S. colleges and universities	4.3	
It is of value to the home country of the foreign student	8.1	
It is of value to the individual foreign student	24.8	
It contributes to international understanding	43.8	
It contributes to United States campus life in general	6.2	
It is of foreign policy value to the United States Government	1.9	
It adds to the prestige of the American college or university	1.0	

there is much and 59 percent believe there is moderate interaction. Sixty-two percent of the faculty favor a social organization for American and foreign students, particularly as a means of fostering interaction.

At the same time a striking finding is that more than 45 percent of the total faculty in the survey do not know approximately how many foreign students are on their campus. One can, undoubtedly, argue against publicizing such figures; however, the inability of almost one-half of the professors to offer any estimate suggests a lack of recognition of the role of foreign students on the campus.

An additional point is that the same proportion--45 percent--do not know who does or who should give foreign students academic and personal counseling. The percent who do not know who does or should offer tutoring or help with English language is even higher. According to all organizational communication and efficiency criteria, this situation warrants attention. Furthermore, it offers some confirmation of Higbee's conclusion about the lack of status recognition of the foreign student advisor.[1]

C. Is The World Our Campus?[2]

Every year for many years there has been an increasing number of American faculty members abroad. This year there was a 13 percent increase, bringing the total to 3,793 faculty persons outside the United States on an educational assignment.[3] The activities of these men and women are varied, although a few years ago a study revealed that between 40 and 45 percent of overseas faculty were involved in some form of technical assistance.[4] Evaluation studies of the government—financed overseas programs for faculty (notably under the Fulbright-Hays program) have consistently lauded the efforts and pointed to the important contributions which American professors make abroad.[5] There are strong recommendations from several quarters to extend the overseas training and experiences to more faculty.[6] As one report has put it,

> The faculty member who has taught abroad is likely to be a better teacher for having gained a broader view of his subject. ...his ability to impart this knowledge to students will be improved. Both inside and outside the classroom, the teacher with experience abroad can have a significant impact on the world outlook of students. His courses lose some of their cultural bias; he gives his students perspective on their own society and culture. He becomes more effective in preparing students for study abroad and in teaching foreign students...finally, whether or not he was engaged in research, new ideas for research projects often develop.[7]

Several foundation and institute reports published in the past few years have not only encouraged faculty overseas involvement, but have raised questions for college and university administrators in planning for such faculty involvement.[8] The over-all findings decidedly favor faculty collaboration with foreign scholars, overseas teaching and research, involvement in technical assistance and other international education activities which are increasingly available. Amidst this rash of reports and enthusiastic supporting essays on the desirability of American faculty involvement in international educational phenomena, very little research has been done to determine faculty interest and orientation. The research here reported is an attempt to help fill this void.

To begin with, the subjects in this study are faculty at private universities, none of whom has a direct institutional association with a foreign university, none of whom has a technical assistance contract in effect with a foundation or the American government. This places the faculty in this study in the same category with a great many American professors, but in a different category from academic persons at universities with large-scale overseas technical assistance contracts and programs in effect. Michigan State University had more faculty abroad last year than comprise the total faculty at most of the schools included in this study.[9] However, as the findings demonstrate, there is considerable international interest and involvement among Cleveland area faculty.

Professors were asked to identify the role of American colleges and universities in international education and how institutions should fulfill such roles. One professor suggested the following:

> 1) Send information to universities in other countries...admit qualified foreign students to both undergraduate and graduate programs.

2) Cooperate with government in making faculty available for training in specialized areas for Peace Corps, etc.; for example, Cornell University-Peru project.
3) Foster faculty exchanges, sabbatical leaves, etc.
4) Have administrative offices specifically allocated for dealing with foreign student affairs in the university.

Another person stressed the following university actions:

1) Should have adequate faculty and provide a program for students wishing to specialize in world affairs, etc., plus opportunity for those not specializing to become "world conscious" through elective courses.
2) Should encourage international exchange of faculty and students.
3) Should stimulate student awareness through university-sponsored lectures, student activities, etc.

There is here a projection of the broad international role of the university in world affairs and international education. At the same time, faculty members define their own roles in a variety of ways, from a narrow teaching role to broad goals which include, according to one man:

1) Teach international students on campus; 2) Foster exchange programs; 3) Help prepare young Americans for work in other countries; 4) Teach and consult in other countries as requested.

The general conclusion is that most professors believe that there is a role for the college and university to play in international education and world affairs, including on-campus and off-campus activities. Most professors think that they also have a personal, professional role to play--in some cases restricted to the classroom and student interaction, and in some cases very broadly defined, including overseas activities of various sorts. Eleven percent of the professors feel that they are not supported in these roles by their college or university, and the remainder believe that they are supported by their institution in performing the role they define in international education and world affairs.

American faculty are in overwhelming support of the programs which send

American faculty abroad and bring foreign scholars to this country, as shown in Table 5.5. While in favor of the programs for American students to go abroad, faculty are less supportive than are the students themselves: 97 percent of the students and 84 percent of the faculty support programs for American students abroad. Presumably, this reflects some skepticism about the academic worth of some overseas programs for students, which is revealed in personal conversations with professors.

TABLE 5.5

AMERICAN FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE
(In Percentages)

	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know	Total
Junior year abroad and other school programs outside the U.S. for American students should be continued.	83.5	6.1	10.4	212
Fulbright and other programs which send American faculty abroad should be continued.	96.7	1.4	1.9	213
Fulbright and other programs which bring foreign faculty to American schools should be continued.	97.2	1.4	1.4	212

Faculty are involved in international education to a significant degree as documented in Table 5.6. From somewhat less to somewhat over one-quarter of the professors in the study are involved or have been involved in comparative or international research and collaboration with foreign scholars; they belong to, and attend meetings of international professional societies.

TABLE 5.6

AMERICAN FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES
(In Percentages)

	In the past I have engaged in:	I am currently engaged in:	Both	Total
Comparative or international research	44.4	31.1	24.4	45
Collaboration with foreign scholars	59.7	14.0	26.3	57
Belong to international professional societies	23.6	36.4	40.0	55
Attend international professional meetings	53.9	26.2	20.0	65

A further measure of commitment and interest is the range of expectations which are presented in Table 5.7. The proportion of faculty expecting to travel outside of the United States is not surprising (77 percent). It is significant that 6 percent of the faculty expect to become involved in some sort of technical assistance program--since the institutions at which these persons teach are currently not involved in such activities. Faculty interest clearly goes beyond the present international scope of the particular colleges and universities. Thirty percent of the professors expect to do research outside of the United States and 18 percent expect to teach in another country. These figures also indicate a substantial interest in the kinds of international academic activities which are increasingly available to American academic persons.

TABLE 5.7

AMERICAN FACULTY EXPECTATIONS OF INVOLVEMENT IN INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES
(In Percentages)

	Yes	No	Don't Know	Total
I expect to travel outside of the United States in the future.	76.5	6.6	16.9	213
I expect to live outside the United States for some length of time in the future.	22.2	44.8	34.0	203
I expect to teach outside the United States in the future.	18.4	38.3	43.2	206
I expect to do research outside the United States in the future.	30.0	35.5	34.5	203
I expect to be involved in a technical assistance program (AID, etc.) outside the United States in the future.	5.6	52.6	41.8	196

The faculty interest may go beyond the present administrative arrangements of the respective institutions; however, a relevant factor is the faculty perception of the interest from colleagues, administration, and, in some areas, students, in the various facets of international education and exchange. Such data are contained in Table 5.8. These data are interesting both in terms of what they indicate about overall interest and in differences which faculty perceive in the interest of faculty, students and administration. For example, faculty believe that the administration and the faculty are more interested in sending American students abroad than are the students themselves. As shown earlier, students are more interested than faculty in such programs. Faculty

TABLE 5.8

AMERICAN FACULTY ASSESSMENT OF INTEREST IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION AND EXCHANGE
(In Percentages)

Interest in:	A great deal of interest	Some interest	No interest	Don't know	Total Number
International affairs:					
Students	19.8	65.6	4.2	10.4	192
Faculty	47.2	41.5	1.0	10.3	195
Administration	42.8	39.0	5.4	12.8	187
Sending American students abroad:					
Students	24.6	52.5	8.7	14.2	183
Faculty	27.4	51.6	7.4	13.7	190
Administration	32.4	37.8	14.1	15.7	185
Bringing foreign students to U.S. school:					
Students	14.4	50.0	19.4	16.1	180
Faculty	27.7	53.2	4.8	14.4	188
Administration	29.7	48.7	7.0	14.6	185
Sending American faculty abroad:					
Faculty	33.5	46.1	5.2	15.2	191
Administration	24.5	44.2	15.4	16.0	188
Bringing foreign scholars to U.S. schools:					
Faculty	33.3	46.4	6.3	14.1	192
Administration	30.5	47.4	7.9	14.2	190
University involvement in technical assistance programs:					
Faculty	14.3	52.2	15.9	17.6	182
Administration	22.7	39.8	19.9	17.7	181

see American students as being very much less enthusiastic about bringing foreign students to American schools than are the faculty and administration. The same is true also for general interest in international affairs, about which faculty believe students are very much less concerned. Professors think that they are more interested than the administration in sending faculty abroad, and in bringing foreign faculty to American schools. On the matter of college or university involvement in technical assistance programs, it is felt by faculty that the administration manifests considerably more interest than the faculty. While both students and faculty project a significant international orientation, it seems that perhaps the faculty under-evaluate student interest.

What obtains in the comprehensive outlook is that the faculty perceive a considerable interest in international education and exchange among their students, faculty colleagues and among the administration. From one-fifth to two-fifths of each group is seen by the faculty as having a great deal of interest in all but a few of the cases, while the proportion with no interest is thought to be under one-fifth in all cases. As shown in Table 5.9, faculty believe that they are the most important source of impetus for international educational exchange on their campus. Faculty members appear to give an

TABLE 5.9

MOST IMPORTANT SOURCE OF IMPETUS FACULTY RECEIVED FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION AND EXCHANGE
(In Percentages)

	Total Number = 197
President	17.8
Faculty	27.4
Deans	10.2
Students	1.5
Board of Trustees	0.5
Alumni	0.5
Other	3.6

affirmative answer to the question: Is the world our campus?

D. Implications and Conclusions

Faculty members support international educational exchange and perceive themselves as being more supportive than American students. This enthusiasm reflects the substantial involvement and overseas experiences which professors have had, whether as students themselves, in research, in some overseas appointment, or in a professional association. A good many professors anticipate overseas work of some sort in teaching, research or technical assistance. This orientation reflects national trends. The academic profession is becoming more internationally experienced and concerned, both in on-campus and off-campus activities. Planning on the college and university campuses, in terms of curriculum, sabbatical and leave opportunities, research and overseas programs should incorporate or provide for the apparent interest of a sizeable component of American college and university faculty members. Specifically, the findings from this study indicate a considerable interest in international aspects of higher education among Cleveland area professors. This is relevant for administrators and programmers who are interested in developing international aspects of education in keeping with the national patterns and also in keeping with local faculty interests.

Another finding is that the overwhelming majority of professors are in favor of bringing foreign faculty and foreign students to their campuses. A majority endorse increasing the number of foreign students on campus. Professors see a variety of benefits deriving from foreign students attending American schools, but they particularly stress benefits for the students and the contributions which such programs make to international understanding.

They find foreign students motivated and interested, more so than are American students. At the same time the professors find that there are special problems for foreign students: familiarity with the American system of education, fluency in the English language, and so on. A great many of the professors are not aware of the number of foreign students on their campus, what services are provided for foreign students, or who does and who ought to be providing such services. This suggests the need for both better communication between the administration and faculty and for the faculty to have greater familiarity with the foreign student advisor's role. A few volunteered comments support the suggestion that faculty should become more involved in decision-making with regard to foreign students and in terms of general institutional policies in international education.

The implications of this chapter are that faculty members are important international education resources--both in terms of interest as well as experience, and that professors support educational exchange and the enrollment of foreign students in their respective colleges and universities. Faculty members apparently need to become more informed about foreign student programs and services on their campuses. But they also need to become involved in planning international educational activities, particularly as they affect professors' overseas teaching, research and professional activities. The perspectives of the college and university administration with regard to educational exchange and policy-making in international education are offered in the next chapter.

Footnotes

1. Homer D. Higbee, The Status of Foreign Student Advising in United States Colleges and Universities (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1961).

2. The section heading is borrowed from the book by the same title: Walter Adams and John A. Garraty, Is The World Our Campus? (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1960).

3. Institute of International Education, Open Doors, 1965, pp. 13-15.

4. Edward W. Weidner, et.al., The International Programs of American Universities (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1958), p. 35.

5. See, for example, U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, A Beacon of Hope: The Exchange-of-Persons Program, Washington, April 1963; Board of Foreign Scholarships, Experiment in International Understanding, Washington, October 1963.

6. George N. Shuster, Report to the Committee on Intercultural Studies in Colleges and Universities (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education).

7. Education and World Affairs, The College and World Affairs, February 1964, pp. 15-16.

8. Committee on Educational Interchange Policy, College and University Programs of Academic Exchange, March 1960, pp. 22-25. This report raises specific questions geared to college and university administration concerned with increasing the participation of their faculty in overseas and international activities.

9. According to Open Doors, 1965, op.cit., p. 14, Michigan State University had 215 faculty members abroad on educational assignment in 1964-1965. In 1963-1964 the catalog listed fewer than this number as full-time faculty at Case Institute of Technology, Baldwin-Wallace College and John Carroll University.

CHAPTER VI

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

A. Introduction

A basic focus in sociology is upon the dynamic aspects of societies, cultures and institutions and the ways in which they change. This makes an inquiry into the nature of university policy-making and planning a very germane sociological problem. Among university persons, there is a conviction that rigid blueprints are unacceptable, although guidelines and directions for policy and planning are both desirable and useful. It is the intent of this discussion to examine the perspectives of the college and university administrations concerning international education and exchange, the nature of policy-making and the orientation towards planning in these areas. Administrators interviewed include presidents, vice-presidents, deans, foreign student advisors, admission counselors, and others.

The number of administrators interviewed does not make a statistical analysis and presentation meaningful. Hence, the discussion is concerned with the individual impressions and perspectives and the themes which are patterned or run throughout all interviews.

B. Perspectives on Foreign Students

Several generalizations may be offered which are pertinent to this inquiry. First, all of the colleges and universities anticipate a growth in total enrollment. At one institution the prediction is for a 25 percent increase by the end of the present decade, at three schools the expectation is a 50 percent increase, and at the remaining institution the growth will be staggering as the transition from a private college to a state university occurs. Second, the administration at each institution, except the last mentioned above, expect the nature of the school to remain the same; that is, liberal arts college or technical institution, etc. Third, with the exception of the developing public institution, the remaining schools are private with the implied and perceived financial problems that characterize privately-supported colleges and universities. These elements all serve to influence the perspectives of the university administration about foreign student enrollments, services, and so on.

The role of foreign students on the campus differs, to some extent, from one institution to another. At one college, the school senses a responsibility for accepting students recommended by the missionaries abroad in the denomination operating the college. One theme which runs through the interviews is that foreign students add to the intellectual milieu of the school and are important resources for American students. This stems from the belief that international understanding and cultural study is an important part of the educational process and that having students from other countries on the campus facilitates learning for the American student. The philosophy is more characteristic of the liberal arts colleges than of the institutions with graduate and professional schools. One college president feels that foreign students on campus generate faculty interest in international activities.

The college and university administrators as a group are more concerned with administrative rather than policy questions as they apply to foreign students. Specifically, persons at each institution express the sentiment that the school should accept more foreign students, but is financially restricted in doing so. In some instances, it appears that the school is prepared almost immediately to accept a significantly large number of students, if they can meet their own expenses through grants or family assistance. At Western Reserve University, there is a large increase in the number of students accepted for the 1965-1966 academic year, while the changes at the other institutions are modest.

Foreign student advisors quite obviously are best able to discuss foreign student needs, problems and the nature of institutional services. Yet, presidents, deans and others at each college and university are sensitive to the problems of selection of foreign students and foreign student language difficulties.[1] One school has a policy of only accepting foreign students on a transfer basis after they have successfully completed at least one year in another American school. With the developments in overseas language testing and evaluation, this should be less of a problem for most schools. Several administrators endorse a joint language program for foreign students attending schools in the area.

Opinions are divided concerning the services which ought to be available for foreign students. Some top administrators believe that foreign students are similar to minority groups and hence the effort should be to fully integrate them into campus life. They would offer no special services but would continue to provide foreign students with the same services available to all students. Most believe that special services are needed: academic and personal counseling by a specialized foreign student advisor; language assistance; special orientation; social programming such as participation in community events, and the host assignment arrangements of the Council on World Affairs.

Something of a paradox emerges when the responses to questions on services and responsibilities for services are examined. Most administrators at local colleges and universities think that the services of the Cleveland Council on World Affairs, such as hosting students, are well operated. However, two presidents are critical of the narrow exposure the student receives and urge a broadening of contacts in the community. Other presidents, deans and foreign student advisors believe that more services should be operated by the respective educational instutions. They point out the inadequacy of counseling services. A majority view is that social programs should serve to integrate the foreign students into the mainstream of campus life. The school administrators consistently criticize the Council on World Affairs' International Student Center as working against this goal; that is, the administrators think that the International Student Center ghettoizes the foreign students. While they support an international student organization, some are convinced that it should be campus-centered and operated. The paradox is simply that the local institutions have not maintained many services for foreign students, but have contributed financially to the Council on World Affairs to operate a program. In the words of one of the foreign student advisors, "The schools have used the Council as a crutch." At the same time, several men advocate the operation of services essential to foreign students and are convinced that they should be run by the college and university on the campus.

Since the program operated by the Council on World Affairs already coordinates non-academic programs for all of the area colleges and universities, one might expect sympathy for collaborative programs for foreign student services. Indeed, the administrators laud cooperative efforts in social programming and hosting, and endorse other joint services and programs--notably an orientation for new foreign students, special language training, and possibly non-academic counseling. The last, however, is seen as primarily the responsibility of the particular institutions. Several administrators suggest that the International Student Center be abandoned. At the same time, these persons propose campus-centered international student activities, which might be jointly operated by those schools in physical proximity to one another.

To summarize, there is a good deal of support for jointly operated programs for foreign students in the Cleveland area. College and university administrators advocate that some services be run by the Council on World Affairs, particularly greeting upon arrival in the city, driving, host family arrangements, tour and community programs. However, there is a clear preference for the institutions themselves to provide the counseling services and the base for social life which integrates the foreign students and facilitates their interaction with Americans on the campus. If the analogy is used further, one might conclude that the crutch of the Council on World Affairs should be pulled out from under, compelling the institutions to walk on their own; or, the colleges and universities need to gain strength in programs, services and personnel in order to abandon reliance on the crutch.[2]

The final dimensions of the perspectives of the college and university administrators are those of planning and the perceived relationships between foreign student admissions and services and the total operation of the respective schools. Most of the administrators are aware of foreign students on the campus, although one dean and one president apparently are sufficiently removed from the actual operations so as to be somewhat uninformed as to the number of foreign students and the services. The significance of this is only that it gives an indication of the perceived role of foreign students in the total institutional perspective and the importance of foreign students in the planning of the school's future policies.

Although there are administrators at every institution who encourage a larger foreign student enrollment, each school realistically anticipates only a very modest increase. This reflects financial limitations, or the nature of the institution and its policies (such as not accepting students arriving directly from another country). It is unlikely that the number of foreign students will rise significantly in most of the schools, although the indication for the next year is that there will be a large increase at one university.

The perspective of the institution and its administration is critical in understanding enrollment trends. One school president clearly indicates that as he sees it, the function of his institution is to educate Americans, although he feels they should have a broad international outlook.

One foreign student advisor is unsure of the school's view of the role of foreign students on the campus. He doubts that there will be an increase on his campus since there is no such commitment. While there is support for foreign students, their contribution to the international climate, and the positive effects of interaction with Americans on campus, the administrators do not reflect some of the objectives frequently given: United States responsibility to assist the underdeveloped countries, Cold-War diplomacy, the importance of educating tomorrow's world leaders, etc.[3] One school administrator mentioned the obligation to the denomination supporting the school, but the service orientation and its relevance to foreign students is lacking in the Cleveland area colleges and universities. This may well be an orientation more restricted to the state universities, particularly the land-grant schools with their traditional orientation toward service and extension. The perspectives on the role of foreign students and the services which should be offered are closely related to the orientation of the college and university administration toward other aspects of international education and exchange, which are examined below.

C. Perspectives on General Aspects of International Education and Exchange

A theme which is manifest in the thinking of some college and university administrators is that educational exchange leads to world understanding. This is seen as a reciprocal process, and local administrators support the overseas educational experience of American students. "Understanding" has three usages as suggested by the Useems: factual knowledge, comprehension, and endorsement.[4] Comprehension is of greater importance than factual knowledge; in both cases one does not necessarily lead to the other or to endorsement. Most important, the Useems argue, increased comprehension gives the foreign visitor "...a new frame of reference for thinking--not just a new set of beliefs about the Western World."[5] This view is consonant with the orientation of some presidents, deans and foreign student advisors.

Perhaps this is best indicated by the position taken by a foreign student advisor who states that education is the process of developing an approach to thinking--which must today reflect world culture. Hence, the inherent role of the college and university is to educate students, whether they are American or from other countries, to achieve the international frame of reference. This may take place on the home campus, although the effect of a foreign experience is significant.[6]

There is a growing interest among American students for an opportunity to study abroad. All admissions office persons interviewed for this study report that student interest in some overseas experience is constantly increasing. One of the local institutions is developing a program coordinated with other American institutions to provide an overseas center where American students can spend a year abroad. As one dean put it, there should be an institutionalized program for sending American college and university students abroad. Otherwise, the United States presents a chauvinistic image and foreigners perceive that the United States believes in the superiority of its values and educational system. The indications are clear that students want an opportunity for international educational experience, and that local academic officials and administrators are aware of this interest and of the development of student abroad programs in higher education all over the United States.[7]

In 1961 Higbee reported that, "...it is apparent that not many institutions have systematically considered their role in international education."[8] The absence of an international policy or an integration of programs is manifest in the local colleges and universities. In several of the institutions, administrative and academic officials indicate that there is no policy on foreign students and scholars or overseas activities of American students and scholars, and that there is no conscious relationship between these exchanges. At one school, there are a variety of interests and programs, but no coordination, which one dean feels is a particular problem. At another institution, the interest in American students and faculty going abroad is increasing and there is more interest in foreign faculty, but there appears to be a lack of interest in increasing the enrollment of foreign students.

In summary, the situation at local area institutions is similar to that found at many colleges and universities around the country; namely, a segmentation and lack of coordination of educational programs concerned with international studies and exchanges, and an absence of well-defined policies and goals in international education. Higbee states,

> Quite naturally, most presidents and academic officials gave at least lip service to the broader aspects of institutional involvement in the mutual exchange of faculty, students and knowledge. Yet other objectives have often acted as a brake on implementing this interest to any extensive degree.[9]

The interest in the schools included in this study, goes beyond lip service. However, the financial restrictions and listing of priorities make international developments of subordinate interest. Furthermore, there is a lack of conscious policy examination by the administration and faculty and, in most instances, an ensuing failure to coordinate matters such as foreign students, American students abroad, non-Western studies, visiting foreign faculty, American faculty abroad, on-campus international activities, and so on. Minimal services to foreign students are offered, but these are done out of context and not in concert with the total range of campus activities. That is, the advisor to foreign students and to American students desiring to study abroad may be the same person; however, the relationships between these exchanges and all other on-campus activities are accidental and not planned.

In some cases there is a policy of encouragement for faculty interests in going abroad. However, the more common orientation is one of permissiveness. This reflects the administrative problems of faculty leaves of absence, but also suggests a gap between local administrative support for the international role of faculty and the enthusiasm registered in national educational and foundation circles. For example, one report states that,

> ...over a period of time it (the institution) should encourage as many faculty as possible to take advantage of opportunities for foreign study, research, teaching, and, where appropriate, participation in overseas programs. Further, because the gains to the institution are great, it should provide financial assistance and other incentives when needed, rewarding not in fact penalizing, faculty for their efforts.[10]

The interest in faculty activity is not consistent in the local colleges; but then, there is no uniform endorsement of other developments in international education--from curriculum matters to off-campus international educational activities. The college and university administrators differ somewhat amongst themselves at the same institution, and there are variations from one school to another. The one conclusion which applies equally is that the total perspective on planning and the integration of international aspects of higher education is essentially lacking at the local area colleges. This relates to the policy and decision-making, and the planning perspectives and also to matters of personnel and services.

D. International Educational Policy-Making and Planning

As already indicated, the college and university administrators state that the institutions do not have policies concerning international aspects of education and exchange. Some lament this lack of a clear policy, while others only comment upon a lack of interest or feelings of inappropriateness for the school to have international educational policies and programs.

Presidents, vice-presidents and deans are relatively unconcerned about the technical operations of foreign student advising and apparently are content to let the foreign student advisor (in some cases this is the Dean of Students) function as he sees fit.[11] Foreign student enrollments and services are not integrated into general institutional policy-making, at least at the top administrative levels. In general, the foreign student advisors' responsibilities and influence on the respective campus is limited and restricted to services to foreign students. At several of the institutions, the foreign student advisors have, with institutional permission, attended workshops of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Policies may be seen as emanating from the board of trustees, the administration, the faculty, and the students. Students and alumni traditionally do not influence policy in a direct way. One president indicates that international educational interests should come from the faculty and only then should the administration consider proposals. Another president advocates administrative leadership with efforts to enlist faculty support. Most presidents, deans, foreign student advisors and others interviewed state that the boards of trustees are rather little concerned with international educational policy making, except as to indicate preference for the education of Americans, or particularly local students.

Admission of foreign students is determined in consultation between the admissions office and a faculty admissions committee in some schools, and with an international student committee at one institution. Since no established American student abroad program exists, there is no policy, although most administrators recognize the growing interest among students for such activities. Similarly, they sense the faculty involvement in overseas programs, but initiative is placed upon the individual professor to make his own arrangements.

It is clear that it is irrelevant to examine the source of policy determination if the academic officers and administrators do not sense any policies concerning admission of foreign students, American students and faculty going abroad, recruitment of visiting foreign faculty, the internationalizing of the curriculum, institutional involvement in technical assistance programs, and so forth. Such is the situation in the area schools studied. Lack of a policy is a characteristic of most of the schools. Where there is a policy, it is specific as to admission of foreign students (for example, only taking foreign students who have resided in the United States more than one year) or it is vague and permissive (allowing faculty to take overseas leave or permitting a student to take overseas work for credit if worked out with an advisor). Where the administrations sense a policy, it comes from either administration personnel or administrators in conjunction with faculty.

For the past number of years attempts have been made in numerous policy papers, conferences and reports to reach college and university administrators, make suggestions, and influence policy with regard to the international role of American colleges and universities. There is a heavy concentration of international programs among a rather small number of institutions; yet, a large number of schools have some relevant activities--be it accepting foreign students or offering courses in non-Western cultures. A question raised in this study is: what impact are national developments in international education having upon the institutions included in the study? This is best measured by inquiring of the administrators if they are influenced by such developments and/or the materials distributed by the American Council on Education, Education and World Affairs, the Ford Foundation, Institute of International Education, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs and other agencies and foundations.

All administrative officials interviewed at one institution indicate that such national reports are irrelevant for their particular institution, which has no policies and interests in international education along the lines usually encouraged. At another institution the president is concerned about imposing policy upon the faculty, and would rather have the faculty suggest it to the administration; hence, the nationally-distributed materials have little impact. However, another administrator at the same institution likens the international educational interest and reports to the impact upon admissions which recent publicity upon culturally disadvantaged youth has had. At one institution, two administrative officials believe that a change is coming and that the influence of national developments is being felt. Some specific suggestions from published documents (for example, the creation of a university-wide faculty committee on foreign student affairs) are being seriously considered. One college president states that national educational and world affairs developments have definitely influenced the emphasis upon comparative cultures and other curriculum changes introduced to give the student an international sensitivity. The National Association for Foreign Student Affairs has influenced the local institutions in regard to foreign student admissions and services to some extent. However, there is also a negative reaction. One president rejects the validity of an institution shaping its policies in accord with foundation recommendations so as to be assured of receiving money.

In general, the administrative officials, from presidents to foreign student advisors and admissions office staff, are rather little influenced by the research reports, conference recommendations, and policy advise circulated by national organizations, agencies and foundations. There is a clear policy at some institutions of automatically diverting such materials away from the presidents and vice-presidents (for whom much of this material is intended) and passing it on to the foreign student advisor--who is the only staff person obviously involved in international educational administration. There is a lack of institutional policy and planning on international aspects of education, and the top level administrators are not being influenced very significantly by the urgings from many quarters to develop such policy and to initiate appropriate planning. The implications of this will be considered below.

E. Implications and Conclusions

It is apparent that most administrators at the local institutions are less concerned with foreign student programs and with other aspects of international education than they are with more traditional activities of academic administration. In addition, they are sensitive to the problems of privately-supported institutions. Each school anticipates growth in total enrollment and is facing the increasing need for faculty, facilities and funds for such growth. This all militates against innovation and planning, particularly in areas which are not considered important or an integral part of the educational program.

While the administrators are in sympathy with the broadened scope of faculty and student participation in overseas programs and the enlarging of on-campus programs, these are subordinate to the more traditional objectives of higher education. In some areas the interest of students and faculty is abundantly clear, and the administrations are more prepared to develop programs. The presidents, deans, and others are aware of national developments, but are rather little influenced by them in terms of local policy implementation. Greater encouragement of faculty and students to go abroad will probably be forthcoming. Some slight increase in foreign student enrollments is to be expected. If one of the institutions is asked to engage in some technical assistance project it is possible that the institution will respond affirmatively. However, there is no coordination of these activities and the planning for future college and university international roles is inadequate.

Two implications are apparent. First, the goals in international education need to be more clearly articulated in terms of their critical relationship with the traditional goals of American higher education. Second, the implementation of such goals requires both planning and financing of a magnitude which goes beyond the human and financial resources of the particular institutions. The final chapter of this report will deal with these points.

Footnotes

1. Homer Higbee also reports that presidents and academic officials at a large number of institutions included in his survey are concerned about foreign student finances, English language fluency, and academic preparation. Homer Higbee, *The Status of Foreign Student Advising in United States Universities and Colleges* (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1961), pp. 42-43.

2. It is obvious that communication and coordination between the schools and the Council on World Affairs is essential, both in planning and in the actual operation of programs. This point of strategy is taken up in the final chapter of this report, under recommendations.

3. For an answer to the question: Why foreign students?, see Education and World Affairs, *The Foreign Student: Whom Shall We Welcome?*, New York, 1964, pp. 3-5.

4. John Useem and Ruth Hill Useem, *The Western-Educated Man in India* (New York: The Dryden Press, 1955), p. 134.

5. *ibid*., p. 135.

6. For a discussion on the impact of foreign experience upon the individual, see: George V. Coehlo, "Personal Growth and Educational Development Through Working and Study Abroad," *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 18 (1962), pp. 55-67.

7. On American student abroad programs, see Edward W. Weidner, *The World Role of Universities* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), Chapters 4, 5, 6.

8. Higbee, *op.cit*., p. 44.

9. *ibid*., p. 45.

10. Education and World Affairs, *The College and World Affairs*, New York, February 1964, p. 15.

11. Higbee, *op.cit*., states that, "Problems of internal organization for servicing foreign students seem not to concern the presidents to any marked degree." (p. 43) Foreign student advisors are removed from top level administrators and academic policy-makers, and they are generally rather independent in daily operations.

CHAPTER VII

AN OVERVIEW--INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION: A COMMUNITY STUDY

A. Summary of Findings

The objective of this study was to present a research panorama of the various components or participants in the international aspects of higher education and exchange. Thus, data was presented in earlier chapters on foreign students, American students, American professors and administrators, members of the community involved with foreign visitors, as well as information on the visiting foreign faculty, historical and national trends, and local programs. Before integrating these findings, a brief summary is offered.

Foreign Students

The college and university students from other countries are mostly male, graduate students, and from the less-developed nations of the world.[1] Two-fifths of the students are self-supporting, one-fifth of the students are in engineering with the same proportion in the natural and physical sciences. Foreign students interact with Americans to a significant degree. One-third of the foreign students live with Americans. The great majority of foreign students are satisfied with their opportunity for meeting Americans, which reflects their social intercourse, dating, visiting of American homes, and informal contact.

The foreign students are academically satisfied, although some complaints are registered, such as the inapplicability of theoretical knowledge. Language is a problem, but not a severe one for the majority. Foreign students manifest some personal and academic problems, but utilize counseling facilities only in a moderate amount. One-third of the students have transferred from one American institution to another, and one-quarter have been in the United States one year or longer before enrolling in their present school. Most students return directly to their home country after completing their studies, but some plan to remain in the United States.

American Students

American students are interested in international educational exchange and the majority aspire to travel abroad, some as students attending a foreign college or university. Foreign languages are being studied by most students, and interest in international relations and in other cultures is significant.

American students mostly interact with foreign students in residences, through classroom associations, and in organizations. Only 10 percent of American students date foreigners. There is modest support in this study for the hypothesis that students who participate socially on the campus are more likely to score high on a measure of interaction with foreign students. But, the great majority of the American students are not involved in the International Student Group and Center.

American Faculty

Professors also have been caught up in the burgeoning enthusiasm for international education and the interest in participation in overseas activities. They support educational exchange and university programs overseas. In addition, faculty are in favor of curriculum developments which internationalize the students and lead to broad world understanding.

Most professors have foreign students in class. They judge foreigners to be more motivated and interested than Americans, although sometimes less accomplished due to inadequate backgrounds and language difficulties.

Faculty members are not knowledgeable about the services for foreign students and the operation of programs both within the colleges and universities and outside. They are not involved in institutional decision-making concerning international programs but believe that they are the most interested population involved. Faculty members recommend increased international educational involvement and policy determination which moves in this direction--in terms of curriculum, faculty and student exchanges and other programs.

College and University Administration

The clearest conclusion from this population is that the institutions lack an articulated policy and do not coordinate various aspects of international education such as visiting foreign students and American students abroad. There is a gap between academic officials and top administrators and those persons concerned with foreign student programs, so that the latter are largely autonomous. Yet, there is an upward flow of communication and college and university administrators are aware of faculty and student overseas interests, the inquiries from prospective students about college-abroad possibilities, increasing enrollments in foreign languages and foreign culture courses, and so on. Similarly, the administrators are cognizant of developments in colleges and universities around the country, although advisory reports on aspects of international education are either not read by top administrators or they have little specific impact in terms of program development and implementation.

Community Members

The business community plays a modest role in international education--one restricted to world affairs discussion involvement and some hosting activities. Participation in foreign student summer placement programs and other such service and educational programs has not been forthcoming to any great extent.

Hosts to foreign students are active, well-educated persons. They are organizationally involved, internationally traveled and familiar with foreign languages. They are well above average in income and occupational prestige, thus representing a particular segment of the community. Hosts have positive experiences with foreign students, are pleased with the opportunities to participate and are convinced of the worth of such programs. Hosts are less cognizant of their own personal rewards from hosting than they are of the benefits to the foreign student being hosted. That is, hosts view the program as being service-oriented. Most families favor some type of orientation and do plan to continue in their participation as foreign student hosts.

B. Integration of Findings Into Community Perspective

This study is not an effort to obtain a "Rashoman-perspective"--after the famous Japanese movie which examines the perspectives on a specific event from the position of each of the participants, to document differential perception. Indeed, persons in different positions do see events differently and are affected by the events in varying ways. This is true for the various social categories examined in this study. It is to be expected that foreign students and American host families will see their relationship from divergent viewpoints. Similarly, faculty and administration approach overseas work from somewhat distinct orientations. There is no assumption about the greater accuracy of one view as contrasted to another. The viewpoints are not compared to test the reality perception of any category of respondents in the various surveys. Rather, the design is to obtain a comprehensive picture of interest and participation from the several components.

The data in this study suggest a considerable interest in international education and exchange coming from all quarters--students, faculty, administration, community people and foreign students. However, there is apparently more interest in student exchanges than in faculty exchanges, technical assistance or other international activities. The climate on the campuses in the Cleveland area is distinctly one of support for some advances in international activities, but not equivalent to the institutions which manifest a total commitment to their international role. The schools included in this study may offer to become involved in technical assistance, Peace Corps training and evaluation or other similar efforts; however, this is not imminent unless some of the faculty interest and enthusiasm makes a significant impact upon the administration. At one or perhaps two of the institutions, this is more likely to happen, judging from faculty and administrative interests and the resources.

There will probably be a gradual rise in the total enrollments of foreign students, which seems to be generally supported. Financial restriction seems to be the major impediment. The students and faculty clearly want the further development of foreign language offerings, courses in comparative cultures and institutions and in non-Western studies. This is increasingly recognized as part of the expectation of a liberal education. At the same time, interest in American student abroad programs is great among the students and it is likely that the institutions will expand counseling on this matter. Possibly, institutional programs will be developed, if not by the individual schools, then in concert with other schools--as is the case in a number of coordinated programs which send American college and university students abroad as part of their education.

Foreign students attending the Cleveland area colleges and universities interact with a broad range of persons in the host culture. The amount of social contact between foreign students and American fellow-students, professors, families in the community, and other American non-students (for example, at the International Student Center) is considerable. Social relations are primarily generated by community-based organizations such as the Council on World Affairs and church groups, or within the physical setting of the campus--residence halls, class rooms, and so on.

The extent of social relations between American and foreign students is considerably less in some institutions than in others. Small liberal arts colleges with few foreign students generally integrate them more fully into the mainstream of the campus. However, at the institutions which enroll the majority of the Cleveland area foreign students, social interaction is modest. Dating and organizational interaction account for some contact, but the International Student Group fails to bring Americans and foreigners together on a broad scale. While American students and faculty endorse an international student organization, the reality of participation and involvement supports the view of some students and some administrators that the existing organization fails to involve sufficient numbers of students and generate cross-cultural contacts. In its place, they propose a broadly-oriented international organization on the campus which will involve a large number of students around an entire range of international interests.

Foreign students seem to utilize counseling services relatively little, yet manifest some problems which might be ameliorated with adequate counseling. Faculty members appear to be rather uninformed as to the source of counseling on the campus, and the Council on World Affairs does not see its role as including student counseling. This suggests the need for an appraisal of foreign student advising and counseling services and adequate communication on existing procedures. In addition, the language and orientation problems need to be evaluated, with services developed and extended and information transmitted to faculty, community people, and the foreign students themselves.

The foreign students and the administrators are both sensitive to the student's financial problems. The Council on World Affairs has attempted to elicit industrial and business cooperation in a foreign student employment placement program, without success.

Because of the rather unique role played by the Cleveland Council on World Affairs, some over-all planning is called for to better integrate the functions of the Council, the International Student Center, the host family program, and the various services offered for foreign students on the campus. The suggestion from the various perspectives of administrators, faculty and students is that the division of labor ought to be shifted somewhat so that the institutions assume more responsibilities for providing services for foreign students and the Council on World Affairs functions mostly to provide community-oriented non-academic programs. However, the college and university planning for foreign students ought to incorporate the other areas of international education about which students and faculty are increasingly interested.

C. Goals In International Education

> The contemporary world requires of its educated citizens a breadth of outlook and a degree of sensitivity to other cultures unlike any required in the previous history of mankind. This requirement coincides with the universality of viewpoint characteristic of the liberally educated individual. The new and still changing role of the United States in world affairs has gradually come to be recognized, though we have not learned how to prepare ourselves adequately for fulfilling our new responsibility. To do so we must, in addition to the more obvious aspects of international relations, become more sensitive to the many diverse cultures which reflect the myriad manifestations of the human spirit. With the multiplication of new nations, these varying sets of beliefs and values and instinctive habits of behavior become more critical, and an understanding of them becomes central to the development of constructive attitudes and wise policy. Indeed, we must go even farther and recognize the interplay of one culture with another. None is static, least of all our own. To understand ourselves, we must be able to understand both how we differ in outlook and value system from other peoples, and how our own complex network of social, economic, political, and intellectual factors evolved from the interaction of forces within our society and forces acting on it from without.[2]

This statement captures the mood or sentiment of educators all over the United States, who are convinced that, "A first-class liberal education in the second half of the twentieth century should unquestionably include an effective international component."[3] This means the introduction of the student to a culture other than his own and it means developing insights into the varieties of cultures and societies in the world. This is seen as giving the student a better understanding of his own society.

The achievement of this broad goal requires an approach geared to the individual college or university. As Weidner says,

> There is no reason to assume, a priori, that universities have an obligation to engage in a wide variety of international programs. Most American universities include international or world affairs education, international and cross-cultural research, and cooperation with those from countries among their goals, but no university can

> afford to accept a stereotyped formula for achieving them. Each must construct a plan that is most suitable to its resources and to its specific teaching and scholarly objectives.[4]

This ultimately boils down to the critical goal or objective: educational planning for each institution concerned with international aspects of education and exchange.

The goals might be listed as: on-campus development of internationally educated American students; education of foreign students and scholars; provision for American faculty to broaden their horizons and lend their talents to overseas educational programs; opportunity for overseas study and research of American students, both undergraduate and graduate; involvement of departments or total institutions in programs of international exchange, research collaboration and technical-educational assistance. These goals require more than a mere permissive orientation. They call for the resources of the college or university to be used in the best way to provide for the traditional goals of teaching and scholarship and for those goals listed above which a school adopts as part of its policy. This means the adequate provision of services: to foreign students and scholars, to American students interested in overseas study, to faculty interested in overseas research and teaching or financial aid for comparative or international research, and so on. In addition, these goals and the planning called for imply a commitment by the institution which should be infused into the total operation of the school.

The full list of college and university goals in international education and world affairs published in a report a few years ago gives a comprehensive set of considerations.

> 1) All American institutions of higher learning should make studies of world affairs an important and permanent dimension of their undergraduate programs. Such studies should

include the role of the United States in world affairs, Western civilization, important non-Western civilizations, foreign languages and problems of international relations, economic growth, social change and order. Study abroad, effectively organized and directed, should be an important and integral part of undergraduate education.

2) All American universities should improve the competence of their graduate and professional schools to teach and to conduct research on international aspects of their disciplines and professions.

3) Many universities (more than at present) should become diversified centers of strength to train specialists in world affairs for careers in teaching and other professions, government and business; to undertake research; to exercise leadership in language-training and linguistics; to prepare teaching materials for all levels of education; and to open the perspectives of scholarship to other institutions and to adult citizens in their communities. Some centers will focus on particular geographic areas, others on policy problems and functional studies, cutting across disciplinary lines.

4) Most universities and colleges have students and scholars from other countries. These institutions need to develop special educational programs fitting the needs of their foreign guests. At the same time they should integrate these programs as fully as possible with the programs for American students, and with the host institutions' other international programs. Foreign students on American campuses constitute an educational and cultural resource that universities and colleges should draw on more fully. A high priority should be given to better selection and other measures to improve the quality of the students' educational experience. There is also a pressing need to receive more foreign students. Problems of quality and quantity require concurrent attention.

5) Many universities and colleges would benefit from undertaking cooperative activities with educational institutions in other countries. A few should undertake programs of assistance to educational institutions overseas. To carry on effectively these increasingly important activities, the participating university should: develop a high degree of competence on a continuing basis for the particular overseas activities it undertakes; ensure the participation of its best faculty members; and relate its overseas activities to its educational program at home for the mutual strengthening of both.

> 6) *Universities that undertake a wide range of programs in world affairs, at home and abroad, face complex problems of management. Their faculties and administration alike need to develop long range priorities and plans in order to make the most effective use of their scarce resources and make possible the balanced, yet flexible, growth of the total university educational program.*[5] (emphasis in the original)

In addition to the full range of international educational activities and exchanges, this study has focused in considerable measure upon foreign student programs and the impact upon the educational and broader community. Here too it is important to specify the goals, not merely to permit chaotic development, as one report states:

> An institution that regards its foreign students as a mere appendage or an exotic exhibit is doing justice to neither itself nor its students, American or foreign. The selection, admission, and programming for foreign students in an institution of higher learning should be explicitly congruent with the basic purposes of that institution. The planned presence of carefully screened foreign students and their adequate training should constitute an integral part of the educational strategy of the college or university. Only when an educational institution has formulated its own rationale for the presence of foreign students is it likely to make the most effective use of its limited resources in their behalf.[6]

In another report, the nexus of planning and goal setting is suggested:

> The most important thing of all is that each institution should define its international goals and assess and reassess its means of achieving them. *We would urge that every president now appoint a committee to evaluate what his institution is now doing, and how it might be improved.* Whatever decisions are reached, responsibility should be clearly fixed, and the individual or group holding it should have the active support and interest of the highest administrative officials of the institution.[7] (emphasis in the original)

While it is probably reasonable to expect the continuing trend toward more American professors and students going abroad on educational assignments or in academically-related programs, it is certain that the number of foreign students studying in the United States will increase. There will be a continuing concentration of foreign students at some institutions, but also a proliferation of schools enrolling foreign students. The goal of planning a comprehensive foreign student policy with regard to admissions, orientation and counseling, housing, and other services is relevant both to schools with negligible numbers of foreign students, and institutions with a rapidly growing foreign student population. The objectives of enrolling foreign students and how these relate to the total international commitment and interest of the college or university should be assessed and incorporated into the total educational planning.

The goals of international education and exchange have been reviewed. They include a variety of specific endeavors which apply to all schools, for example, internationalizing the curriculum to provide a liberal education based upon a world outlook. These goals also urge the examination of each individual situation in the context of international planning, and call for some careful assessments of policies and the procedures for their implementation. Based upon these general goals and the results of this community study, the concluding section of the report offers some recommendations.

D. Recommendations

The following recommendations are predicated upon the acceptance of some of the over-all goals of international education. They are guided by the data collected for this study, but the recommendations in some cases go beyond the specific findings. The primary objective of this section is to articulate the approach to attaining the general goals in higher educational exchange and international activity and to indicate specific operational recommendations for administrators, practitioners and involved personnel.

The general recommendations are:

1. Each institution should have a faculty-administration committee to assess the role of foreign students, admission policy, determination of services, role of international student organizations, and so on. This would be a general committee on foreign student affairs.

2. A coordinating group, made up of representatives of the committees at each institution and the Council on World Affairs, should be assembled. This group should examine the responsibilities of the institutions viz-a-viz the Council and should agree upon a division of labor. Questions for discussion should include the general role of such organizations as the International Student Group and Center, the base upon which they are organized as well as their scope; the host family program; community involvement; orientation; language training and programs (including those for student wives); housing; etc. This group would be particularly concerned with establishing a division of labor and range of responsibilities so that services would be provided, adequately, efficiently, and with a minimum of unnecessary overlap. At the same time this group would assess the need to expand services and the desirability of altering or dropping others.

3. The institutions should welcome and use the consultative advice available at no cost to the institution through the Field Service Program of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. Such consultation will be helpful in personnel planning for foreign student services, in establishing and improving programs such as orientation, and in the professional development of foreign student advisors and counselors.

4. Each college and university should develop a program to encourage its students to study and research abroad, and should provide adequate counseling

staff for this task.

5. The institutions should develop policies for faculty development, including liberalizing leaves-of-absence, financial arrangements and assistance in securing faculty assignments for overseas work. Faculty exchanges with schools in other countries might be explored.

6. The academic curriculum committee at every academic center should carefully assess the total program and see how it measures up to the standard of offering the undergraduate students a liberal education with an international perspective, and for graduate and professional students, a comparative or cross-cultural approach where appropriate.

7. Each institution should establish a coordinating structure for examining curriculum; student abroad programs; faculty abroad arrangements; foreign student programs, and so on. This structure may be a committee or an individual, but in any event, it should be established by authority of the president and top-level administration. This should be conceived of as a major component in policy determination for the institution, involving the expenditure of human and material resources at all levels. Such a dean or vice-president for international programs or committee on international affairs should include in its scope of analysis the question of institutional involvement in technical assistance or training, either on-campus or overseas. This coordinating structure would systematically evaluate the activities of the institution and its goals, and would assist in the implementation of policies and programs designed to meet the objectives of the institution in the area of international education.

In addition to some of the general recommendations above, the research data suggest a number of more specific recommendations. These are:

1. More information about the institution should be sent by the school to prospective foreign students before the students leave their home country.

2. There should be an orientation before school begins for new foreign students, perhaps in a coordinated program which would serve local schools.

3. Counseling services for foreign students should be broadened. Information about foreign student services should be transmitted to college and university faculty and to the foreign students.

4. Better language training facilities should be available, again perhaps on a joint basis among the institutions.

5. More adequate provisions for advising and encouraging American students to study abroad should be developed.

6. Off-campus international student organizations should be discouraged, while on-campus organizations which integrate the range of international interests should be nurtured, with special facilities provided by the school where possible.

7. A broader segment of the community should be involved in hosting foreign students.

8. Hosts should have an orientation program available which deals with some specifics as well as the broader matter of cross-cultural communication.

9. Business and industry in the community should become more involved in terms of assisting financially, offering employment to foreign students, hosting students, and coordinating with the schools and the Council on World Affairs.

These recommendations, both those which are more specific and those which are more general are meant to be suggestive. There clearly are additional points which might be raised, but many of these will flow more naturally from the implementation of the recommendations already offered. For example, the committee on foreign student affairs will undoubtedly examine the utilization of foreign students as campus resources, or pre-departure orientation for foreign students. The committee on international affairs will certainly raise questions about the recruitment of foreign faculty, the implications of having larger numbers of faculty away from the campus in international programs, the implications involved in the institution seeking out a technical assistance contract which will permit a number of faculty and graduate students to work abroad, and so on.

If the recommendations offered serve, in turn, to stimulate further examination and evaluation, and help provide the bases for intelligent planning in international education on the respective campus, then it will have been worthwhile.

Footnotes

1. Twenty-eight percent of the students in the study come from Canada, Europe and Australia-New Zealand. The remainder come mostly from less-developed parts of the world, although one might argue that Japan, for example, is industrialized.

2. Education and World Affairs, The College and World Affairs (New York, February 1964), pp. 65-66.

3. Education and World Affairs, The University and World Affairs (New York, December 1960), p. 17.

4. Edward W. Weidner, The World Role Of Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), p. 311.

5. The University and World Affairs, op.cit., pp. 4-5.

6. Education and World Affairs, The Foreign Student: Whom Shall We Welcome? (New York, November 1964), p. 5.

7. Committee on the Foreign Student in American Colleges and Universities, The College, the University and the Foreign Student (New York, February 1963), p. 22.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX I

SAMPLING PROCEDURES

The matter of sampling is critical in survey research, since the objective is to maximize research generalizability with adequate and minimum numbers and expenditures. In this study, several different populations were included for analysis, with varying approaches to selecting a sample.

All foreign students at the end of the 1963 spring semester were surveyed, as well as all new students in the 1963 fall semester. The response rate was about 76 percent, with 286 useable cases.

In the early winter of 1964, all host families to foreign students in the program operated by the Cleveland Council on World Affairs were surveyed with a response rate in excess of 90 percent, leaving 143 cases.

In the spring and summer of 1964, a sample was selected from both American students and faculty, stratified by fields of study. The response for students was 56 percent, leaving 376 cases and 54 percent for faculty with 213 cases. As in the survey of foreign students, checks revealed no substantial difference between the respondents and non-respondents which would affect the ability to generalize findings.

Throughout the period of investigation, from 1963 into 1965, interviews were conducted with the college and university administrators. These included all presidents, some vice-presidents and academic deans, some student deans and admissions officers, all foreign student advisors, and a few other administrative officials. The response and cooperation was complete and all attempted interviews were conducted.

Additional interviews were held with staff and volunteers of the Council on World Affairs, labor leaders, business and civic leaders, and others in community organizations involved in international exchange programs. Most interviews sought were completed.

While there is always the possibility in survey research that the findings are not representative of the total populations being studied, in this research there is every indication that the findings may be generalized to the foreign students, American students, college and university professors and administrators, community host families and leaders.

APPENDIX II

FOREIGN STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN THE CLEVELAND AREA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES 1964-1965*

Institutions Included in the Study:	Total
Baldwin-Wallace College	16
Case Institute of Technology	87
Fenn College	4
John Carroll University	23
Western Reserve University	116

Institutions Not Included in the Study:	Total
Carnegie College	1
Cleveland Institute of Art	2
Cleveland Institute of Music	6
Dyke College	3
Notre Dame College	8
Ohio College of Podiatry	3
St. John College of Cleveland	1
St. Mary's Seminary	1
St. Stanislaus Novitiate	14
Ursuline College for Women	2

*Open Doors 1965, Institute of International Education

APPENDIX III

FOREIGN STUDENTS
(In Percentages)

Reasons for Coming to U.S. for Education (Total = 264)

77.1	Education and Training Home country lacks facilities better training/education in the U.S. greater choice of fields advanced work in my field
11.0	Finances offered fellowship/scholarship financially easier able to work while studying just accepted
3.0	Future advantages advancement in home country be of service to home country
6.4	Travel experience of living in another country to live abroad to see the United States
1.9	Friends/relatives in the Cleveland area living in neighboring cities

Amount of information about the U.S. (Total = 285)

0	None
3.5	Very little
50.9	Some
45.6	Very much

Most important source of information about the U.S. (Total = 264)

9.5	Travel in U.S. (personal experience)
2.7	American Information Service/American Consulate
37.5	Friend or relative
6.4	An American
29.9	Books or magazines
1.5	Movies
9.1	Teachers
3.4	Institutes and organizations (i.e. African-American Inst.; industries; schools)

Amount of information about school (Total = 270)

9.9	None
23.7	Very little
55.9	Some
10.4	Very much

Most important source of information about school (Total = 244)

1.6	Personal experience
3.3	American Information Service/American Consulate
35.2	Friend or relative
5.7	Books or magazines
14.3	Teachers
37.7	School
0.4	Professional organization in own field
1.6	I.I.E. or similar organization

Other colleges or universities attended (Total = 284)

67.3	No - no others
28.2	Yes - one
2.8	Yes - two
1.1	Yes - three
0.4	Yes - four or more
0.4	Yes - no number specified

Degree of satisfaction with education (Total = 279)

29.0	Completely satisfied
52.7	Mostly satisfied
11.8	Equally satisfied/dissatisfied
5.4	Mostly dissatisfied
1.1	Completely dissatisfied

Studies compared with foreign students (Total = 255)

10.2	Much better
29.4	A little better
54.5	About the same
4.7	A little worse
1.2	Much worse

Studies compared with American students (Total = 264)

10.1	Much better
26.5	A little better
51.5	About the same
9.3	A little worse
2.6	Much worse

Type of housing (Total = 282)

30.5	College/university dormitory
1.8	College/university apartment
0.7	Parsonage or parish residence
42.9	Private apartment/house
9.9	Room in a rooming house
12.4	Room with an American family
1.8	Fraternity or sorority

Satisfaction with present housing (Total = 286)

30.2	Completely satisfied
51.4	Mostly satisfied
14.7	Equally satisfied/dissatisfied
4.7	Mostly dissatisfied
1.8	Completely dissatisfied

Living with some one (Total = 283)

27.6	No
21.6	Yes - member of family
8.5	Yes - own countryman
8.8	Yes - another foreign student
23.3	Yes - American student
9.5	Yes - American family
0.7	Yes - foreign student and American student

Satisfaction with opportunities to meet Americans (Total = 282)

31.9	Very satisfied
47.9	Satisfied
13.8	Not very satisfied
6.4	Dissatisfied

Visiting American families (Total = 283)

6.0	No
55.5	Yes - 1 through 5
18.0	Yes - 6 through 10
4.6	Yes - 11 through 15
7.1	Yes - 16 or more
8.8	Yes - but no number checked

Reactions to visits (Total = 247)

82.2	Favorable reactions
4.9	Unfavorable reactions
13.0	Both favorable and unfavorable (neutral)

Plan to return to own country (Total = 279)

2.2	No - certain will not return
2.9	No - probably will not return
14.0	Undecided
20.8	Yes - probably will return
60.2	Yes - certain will return

Recommend this school (Total = 274)

9.5	Tell him to go to another school
44.9	Recommend this school highly
32.1	This school as good as any
13.5	Would not say one way or another

Recommend this country (Total = 273)

4.4	Tell him to go to another country
60.4	Recommend this country highly
19.4	This country as good as any
15.8	Would not say one way or another

APPENDIX IV

AMERICAN HOST FAMILIES
(In Percentages)

What was the most important source of your information about the Cleveland Council of World Affairs? (Total = 125)

8.8	A staff member of the Council
67.2	Friend(s) involved in some Council program
5.6	Newspaper
4.0	Printed material from the Council
13.6	Other (specify)
0.8	Television and radio

What was the most important source of your information about the Host Family Program? (Total = 134)

16.4	A staff member of the council
70.1	Friend(s) involved in some Council program
1.5	Newspaper
6.0	Printed material from the Council
6.0	Other

What was the first program you became involved in with the Council? (Total = 138)

2.2	Doctors
68.8	Host families
0	International Wives
15.9	Visitor Hospitality
13.1	No organized program, but volunteer for other activities

To what extent did you feel prepared for being a host to your first foreign student? (Total = 140)

14.3	Thoroughly prepared
71.4	Adequately prepared
10.7	Inadequately prepared
3.6	Thoroughly unprepared

Would you recommend orientation for new potential host families? (Total = 131)

17.6	No
82.4	Yes

In general, how satisfied are you with the Host Family Program? (Total = 138)

48.6	Very satisfied
42.0	Satisfied
4.3	Indifferent
3.6	Dissatisfied
1.4	Very dissatisfied

After this academic year, do you plan to continue in the Host family program? (Total = 126)

78.6	Yes
5.6	No
15.9	Don't know

In general, how satisfied are you with programs of the Cleveland Council on World Affairs? (Total = 121)

26.4	Very satisfied
59.5	Satisfied
10.6	Indifferent
2.5	Dissatisfied
0	Very dissatisfied

How would you rate the importance of the Host Family Program of the following items?

	Very important	Important	Not important	Total
To the Cleveland community	50.7	37.0	12.3	138
To foreign students	74.6	24.6	0.7	138
To international relations	66.9	28.8	4.3	139

How would you rate the importance of the programs of the Cleveland Council on World Affairs on the following items?

	Very important	Important	Not important	Total
To the Cleveland community	42.9	50.4	6.7	119
To foreign visitors and students	67.2	31.1	1.7	119
To international relations	59.3	35.6	5.1	118

If you could change any function or part of the Host Family Program, what would be the most important change you would make? (Total = 101)

5.9	Administrative procedures
12.9	Follow-up orientation programs for continuing hosts
6.9	Orientation programs for new hosts
5.0	Printed materials
8.9	Screening process for host families
44.6	No changes
15.8	Other

To what extent would you say you were informed about your student's country before his (her) visits started? (Total = 138)

14.5	Very well informed
39.9	Somewhat informed
36.2	Informed a little
9.4	Not informed at all

Has the extent of your information changed at all since your student has started visiting? (Total = 138)

8.7	No change in knowledge
91.3	Increased knowledge

Before your student started visiting, did you have any positive or negative feelings toward his country? (Total = 131)

14.5	Strong positive feelings
43.5	Some positive feelings
36.6	Indifferent
4.6	Some negative feelings
0.8	Strong negative feelings

Since the student has started visiting, have your feelings changed? (Total = 130)

47.7	Have become more positive
0.8	Have become more negative
51.5	No change

To what extent do you feel your student is interested in your home and family? (Total = 135)

39.3	Very interested
53.3	Interested
5.9	Indifferent
0	Disinterested
1.5	Very disinterested

Host families' current foreign student: (Total = 141)

47.5	New to the Cleveland area this academic year
9.9	Not new to the Cleveland area, but we are new hosts for the student this academic year.
41.1	Not new to the Cleveland area, and this student has been assigned to us prior to this academic year.
1.5	No current student

APPENDIX V

AMERICAN STUDENTS
(In Percentages)

Type of residence (Total = 366)

29.0	Dormitory or other university housing
16.1	With parents or relatives
45.9	Private apartment or house
2.7	Rooming house
6.3	Fraternity or sorority house

About how many campus extracurricular activities are you taking part in this term? (Total = 368)

53.8	None
14.4	One
14.4	Two
17.4	Three or more

How important a part of college life do you think dating is? (Total = 370)

33.8	Very important
58.1	Moderately important
8.1	Not important

How often on the average did you date this year? (Total = 242)

(130)	Married student, not applicable
8.3	Not at all
9.9	Less than once a month
12.0	Once a month
18.2	Twice a month
21.9	Once a week
14.9	Twice a week
14.9	More often than twice a week

About how many different individuals did you date this year? (Total = 221)

21.3	One
10.9	Two
17.7	Three
13.6	Four
36.7	Five or more

IF YOU HAVE DATED FOREIGN STUDENTS, about how often on the average did you date foreign students this year? (Total = 35)

51.4	Less than once a month
14.3	Once a month
14.3	Twice a month
8.6	Once a week
2.8	Twice a week
8.6	More often than twice a week

About how many different individuals did you date? (Total = 34)

47.1	One
23.5	Two
8.8	Three
8.8	Four
11.8	Five or more

APPENDIX VI

CLEVELAND INTERNATIONAL STUDENT GROUP

Summary of Characteristics of American Members (Total = 38)

Sex	
Male	13
Female	25
Educational Status	
Students	23
Employed	14
No information	1
Academic Status of Students	
Undergraduate	13
Graduate	4
No information	6
Major Field of Students	
Social Work	1
Library Science	1
Social Science	1
Physical, Natural Science	1
No information	19
Age	
33 to 37	1
32 to 28	2
23 to 27	3
18 to 22	3
No information	29
Marital Status	
Single	24
Married	2
No information	12
Housing of Students	
Private housing	8
University housing	15

Summary of Characteristics of Foreign Members (Total = 119)

Sex of Students	
Male	48
Female	17

Educational Status	
Students	65
Non-students	49
Students' wives	3

Academic Status of Students	
Undergraduate	11
Graduate	31
No information	23

Marital Status of Students	
Single	39
Married	8
No information	18

School Attended	
Case Institute of Technology	31
Western Reserve University	25
Fenn College	3
Baldwin-Wallace College	1
John Carroll University	0
Dyke College	1
No information	4

Country of Origin of Students	
Northern Africa	0
Tropical and South Africa	1
North America	3
Middle America	5
South America	0
Southwest Asia	8
South-central Asia	17
Southeast Asia	5
East Asia	5
North and Western Europe	14
Central Europe	3
Southern Europe	3
Oceania	1
No information	1

APPENDIX VII

AMERICAN FACULTY
(In Percentages)

American Faculty Overseas Experiences (Total = 179)

17.3	Student
6.7	Post-doctoral study
6.7	Teaching
20.7	Research
2.8	Technical assistance
7.8	University-government program
5.0	In government employment
8.4	In private employment
33.0	Military service
78.2	Tourist
18.4	Other

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Walter, and John A. Garraty, *Is the World Our Campus?* (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1960).

Agency for International Development, *A Two-Way Street; Benefits Accruing from The International Training Programs of A.I.D.*, (Washington, 1963).

American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, International Study Group II, *Steps Needed to Improve or Develop Programs to Meet the Needs of Foreign Scholars, Students and Trainees*, Centennial Convocation, Kansas City, November 12-16, 1961.

American Council on Education, *Education Without Boundaries*, Washington, November 13-14, 1958.

----------*Toward A Foreign Policy for Higher Education*, Washington, November 19-20, 1959.

----------*The Role of American Higher Education in Relation to Developing Areas*, Washington, November 9, 1960.

----------*Education and the Modernization of Nations*, 1964.

Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, "The Rising Demand for International Education," May 1961.

----------"The Non-Western World in Higher Education," November 1964.

Association of American Colleges, The Commission on International Understanding, *Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts College*. (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: The Evangelical Press, 1964).

Bang, Katherine C., "The Community's Role in the Cross-Cultural Education," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 335 (May 1961), pp. 54-65.

Beals, Ralph L. and Norman D. Humphrey, *No Frontier to Learning. The Mexican Student in the United States*. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1957).

Beckmann, George M., "The Role of the Foundations in Non-Western Studies," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 356 (November 1964), pp. 13-22.

Beebe, George A., *The Foreign Student in the New York City Area*, The Greater New York Council for Foreign Students, October 1955.

Bennett, John W., Herbert Passin, Robert K. McKnight, *In Search of Identity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1958).

Berlo, David K., *The Process of Communication* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1960).

Bidwell, Percy W., *Undergraduate Education in Foreign Affairs* (New York: King's Crown Press, 1962).

Blau, Peter, "Orientation of College Students Toward International Relations," *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 59 (November 1953), pp. 205-214.

Bloland, Paul A., "Developing American-Foreign Student Relationships," American Personnel and Guidance Association meetings, Boston, April 10, 1963.

Blood, R.O. and S.O. Nicholson, "The Attitudes of American Men and Women Toward International Dating," *Marriage and Family Living*, Vol. 24 (February 1962), pp. 35-41.

----------, and S.O. Nicholson, "International Dating Experiences of American Women Students," *Marriage and Family Living*, Vol. 24 (May 1962), pp. 129-136.

----------, and S.O. Nicholson, "The Experiences of Foreign Students in Dating American Women," *Marriage and Family Living*, Vol. 24 (August 1962), pp. 241-253.

Blum, Robert (editor), *Cultural Affairs and Foreign Relations*(Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963).

Board of Foreign Scholarships, *Experiment in International Understanding*, Washington, October 1963.

Boston-Area Seminar for International Students, *Final Report of the Summer Orientation Program*, 1963.

Brickman, William W., *Foreign Students in the United States: A Selected and Annotated Bibliography* (College Entrance Examination Board, 1963),

Brown, Ina Corinne, *Understanding Other Cultures* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963).

Buchanan, William and Hadley Cantril, *How Nations See Each Other* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1953).

Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State, *Summaries of Evaluation Studies of the Educational and Exchange Program*, published periodically.

Butts, R. Freeman, *American Education in International Development* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963).

Cantril, Hadley (editor), *Tensions That Cause Wars* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1950).

Cleveland Council on World Affairs, Report of the Community Relations Committee on the Role of the International Center, mimeographed, 1962.

Coelho, George V., Changing Images of America. A Study of Indian Students' Perceptions (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958).

----------"Personal Growth and Educational Development Through Working and Study Abroad," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 18 (1962), pp. 55-67.

Coen, Clark, A Study of Selected Opinions and Attitudes About the United States, Its Educational System and Particularly That of the Attended Institution, mimeographed, October 1963.

Committee on Educational Interchange Policy, The Goals of Student Exchange (New York, January 1955).

----------Orientation of Foreign Students (New York, June 1956).

----------Expanding University Enrollments and the Foreign Student (New York, February 1957).

----------United States Medical Training for Foreign Students and Physicians (New York, July 1957).

----------The Foreign Student: Exchangee or Immigrant? (New York, May 1958).

----------Twenty Years of United States Government Programs in Cultural Relations (New York, September 1959).

----------College and University Programs of Academic Exchange (New York, March 1960).

----------African Students in the United States (New York, December 1960).

----------Educational Exchange in the Economic Development of Nations (New York, July 1961).

----------A Foreign Student Program for the Developing Countries During the Coming Decade (New York, June 1962).

----------Women in Educational Exchange with the Developing Countries (New York, September 1963).

----------Foreign Professors and Research Scholars at U.S. Colleges and Universities (New York, October 1963).

----------Military Assistance Training Programs of the U.S. Government (New York, July 1964).

----------Educational Exchange in the Atlantic Area (New York, March 1965).

Committee On Foreign Affairs House of Representatives, Winning the Cold War: The U.S. Ideological Offensive, hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, Part IV (1963).

Committee on the Foreign Student in American Colleges and Universities, The College, the University and the Foreign Student (New York, February 1963).

Coombs, Philip H., The Fourth Dimension of Foreign Policy: Educational and Cultural Affairs (New York: Harper & Row, 1964).

Cormack, Margaret L., An Evaluation of Research on Educational Exchange (The Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, 1962).

Deutsch, Steven E., and George Y.M. Won, "Some Factors in the Adjustment of Foreign Nationals in the United States," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 19 (July 1963), pp. 115-122.

Du Bois, Cora, Foreign Students and Higher Education in the United States (Washington: American Council on Education, 1956).

Duijker, H.C.J., and N.H. Frijda, National Character and National Stereotypes, (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1960).

Education and World Affairs, The Committee on the University and World Affairs, The University and World Affairs (New York, December 1960).

----------AID and the Universities (New York, 1964).

----------The Committee on the College and World Affairs, The College and World Affairs (New York, February 1964).

----------The U.S. Office of Education: A New International Dimension (New York, September 1964).

----------The Foreign Student: Whom Shall We Welcome? (New York, November 1964).

Fox, Melvin J., "Foreign Students in American Colleges," College Board Review, Vol. 46 (Winter 1962), pp. 1-8.

----------"English as a Second Language: Development," Overseas, Vol. 3 (January 1964), pp. 14-17.

Gange, John, University Research on International Affairs (Washington: American Council on Education, 1958).

Garraty, John A. and Walter Adams, From Main Street to the Left Bank: Students and Scholars Abroad (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1959).

Goldsen, Rose, Morris Rosenberg, Robin M. Williams, Jr., Edward A. Suchman, What College Students Think (Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1960).

----------, Edward A. Suchman, and Robin M. Williams, "Factors Associated with the Development of Cross-Cultural Social Interaction," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 12 (1956), pp. 26-32.

Greater New York Council for Foreign Students, Factors Related to Financial Problems of Foreign Students, October 1963.

Gullahorn, John T. and Jeanne, American Students in France, Michigan State University, mimeographed.

Haniotis, George V., "An Exercise in Voluntary Repatriation," International Development Review, Vol. 6 (December 1964), pp. 21-22.

Harbison, Frederick, and Charles A. Myers, Education, Manpower and Economic Growth (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964).

----------, and Charles A. Myers, Manpower and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965).

Harris, David, "English as a Second Language: Testing," Overseas, Vol. 3 (January 1964), pp. 22-25.

Henderson, Gregory, "Foreign Students: Exchange or Immigration?" Newsletter of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (November 15, 1964), pp. 1-4, also in International Development Review, Vol. 6 (December 1964), pp. 19-21.

Higbee, Homer D., The Status of Foreign Student Advising in United States Universities and Colleges (East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1961).

----------"Academic Needs of Foreign Students: Some Unresolved Dilemmas Facing American Higher Education," College and University (Summer 1962), pp. 426-432.

Houle, Cyril O. and Charles A. Nelson, The University, the Citizen, and World Affairs (Washington: American Council on Education, 1956).

Institute of International Education, Open Doors 1965 (New York, 1965).

Jacob, Philip E., Changing Values in College (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957).

Jacobson, Eugene, Hideya Kumata, and Jeanne E. Gullahorn, "Cross-Cultural Contributions to Attitude Research," The Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 24 (Summer 1960), pp. 205-223.

Johnson, Walter, American Studies Abroad (Washington: U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, July 1963).

Journal of Social Issues, "Impacts of Studying Abroad," Vol. 18, No.1, 1962.

----------"Human Factors in Cross-Cultural Adjustment," Vol. 19, No. 3, July 1963.

Kelman, Herbert C., "Changing Attitudes Through International Activities," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 18 (1962), pp. 68-87.

Klineberg, Otto, Tensions Affecting International Understanding (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1950).

Lambert, Richard D. and Marvin Bressler, Indian Students on an American Campus (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956).

Lesser, Simon O. and Hollis W. Peter, "Training Foreign Nationals in the United States," Some Applications of Behavioural Research (Switzerland: UNESCO, 1957).

Lissner, Will, "Foreign Students Won Over to U.S. by Family Living," New York Times, June 28, 1964, p. 1.

MacGregor, Gordon, American Fulbright Scholars, Society for Applied Anthropology, 1962.

McClintock, Charles G. and James Davis, "Changes in the Attribute of 'Nationality' in the Self-Percept of the 'Stranger,'" The Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 48 (1958), pp. 183-193.

McDonagh, Edward C., Sven Wermlund, and John F. Crowther, "Relative Professional Status as Perceived by American and Swedish University Students," Social Forces, Vol. 38 (October 1959), pp. 65-69.

Mestenhauser, Josef A. (editor), Research in Programs for Students (New York: National Association of Foreign Student Advisers, June 1961).

Metraux, Guy S., Exchange of Persons: The Evolution of Cross-Cultural Education (New York: Social Science Research Council, June 1952).

Moore, Forrest G., and Robert E. Forman, The University and its Foreign Alumni: Maintaining Overseas Contacts (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1964).

Morris, Richard T., The Two-Way Mirror (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1960).

National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Survey of Hospitality Committees Serving Foreign Students, 1964, March 1965.

National Association of Foreign Student Advisors, Survey of Community Organizations in the United States Serving International Students, April 1963.

National Student Association, The Student Project for International Responsibility (mimeographed, n.d.).

Porter, Robert D. (editor), Selected Studies in Inter-Cultural Education, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, November 1962.

Prator, Clifford, "English As a Second Language-Development," *Overseas*, Vol. 3 (January 1964), pp. 18-21.

Scott, Franklin D., *The American Experience of Swedish Students* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956).

Selltiz, Claire, June R. Christ, Joan Havel, and Stuart W. Cook, *Attitudes and Social Relations of Foreign Students in the United States* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963).

Sewell, William H. and Oluf M. Davidsen, *Scandinavian Students on an American Campus* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1961).

Shaffer, Robert H., and Leo R. Dowling, "Foreign Students and Their American Friends," unpublished Ed.d. dissertation, Indiana University, 1964.

Sharp, Paul F., "The International Commitments of the American College," *Hiram College Alumni Broadcaster*, Vol. 35 (Winter 1964), pp. 9-10, 27.

Shearer, Roberta, *A Comparative Study of American Graduate Student Friends of Foreign Students* (unpublished Ed.d. dissertation, Indiana University, June 1965).

Shuster, George N., *Report to the Committee on Intercultural Studies in Colleges and Universities* (Washington: American Council on Education, n.d.).

Smith, M. Brewster, "A Perspective for Further Research on Cross-Cultural Education," *Journal of Social Issues*, Vol. 12 (1956), pp. 56-68.

Stanford University, *Survey on the Use of the International Center*, mimeographed, May 1962.

Swift, Richard N., *World Affairs and the College Curriculum* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1959).

Tanenhaus, Joseph and Sidney G. Roth, "Non-Immigrant Foreign Students: A Survey of Their Needs and Interests," *The Journal of Experimental Education*, Vol. 31 (December 1962), pp. 173-176.

Thomson, Charles A. and Walter H.C. Laves, *Cultural Relations and U.S. Foreign Policy* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963).

U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, *A Beacon of Hope: The Exchange-of-Persons Program* (Washington, April 1963).

----------*A Beacon of Hope: The Exchange-of-Persons Program Supplement* (Washington, August 1964).

U.S. Office of Education, *International Educational Exchange: A Selected Bibliography* (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961).

Useem, John, "The Community of Man: A Study in the Third Culture," The Centennial Review, Vol. 7 (Fall 1963), pp. 481-498.

----------, and Ruth Hill Useem, The Western Educated Man in India (New York: Dryden Press, 1955).

Warnbrunn, Werner (editor), Research Studies in Inter-Cultural Education, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, April 1960.

Watson, Jeanne and Ronald Lippitt, Learning Across Cultures, A Study of Germans Visiting America (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1955).

Wedge, Bryant M., Visitors to the United States and How They See Us (Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1965).

Weidner, Edward, et.al., The International Programs of American Universities (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1958).

----------, The World Role of Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962).

Wilson, Howard E., Universities and World Affairs (New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1951).

----------, American College Life As Education In World Outlook (Washington: American Council on Education, 1956).

----------, and Florence H. Wilson, American Higher Education and World Affairs (Washington: American Council on Eudcation, 1963).